This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

C
8218
37
5

C 8218.37.5

Controversial Presb.

The Gift of
The Author,
The Rev. A. W. McLeod,
of Halifax,
Nova Scotia.
Rec'd Jan'y 26,
1847.

Presented by the Author

UNIVERSALISM,

IN

ITS MODERN AND ANCIENT FORM,

Brought to the Test;

AND

WITHOUT THE ARGUMENT

FROM

AION, AIONIOS, &c.

SHOWN TO BE UNSCRIPTURAL.

BY ALEXANDER W. M'LEOD.

"I esteem all thy precepts concerning all things to be right; and I hate every false way." PSALMIST.

"With lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad, and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." JEHOVAH.

"The subject before us is not one of cold, useless speculation; it involves the interests of our eternity, and ought ever to be approached under a deep impression, that consequences of everlasting moment depend on the sentiments we adopt respecting it." ANON.

——oOo——

HALIFAX, N. S.
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CUNNABELL,—ARGYLE STREET.

1837.

C 8218.37.5
~~44.102.14~~

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

Jan 26, 1847

PREFACE.

—oOo—

The present work is committed to the Press with the professed design of opposing the progress of a doctrine, the most insidious, delusive, and fatal, of all the heretical doctrines, with which the Christian church has ever been infected.—Opinions of a heterodoxical character, may be broached and disseminated, and, in some instances, from their comparatively harmless tendency, may be allowed to pass without public objurgation; and no especial or important evils follow from such silence. But to allow a doctrine, which strikes a blow at the root of Christianity, and is subversive of the very fundamental truths of Divine Revelation, to pass unnoticed, without some public expression of condemnation, is an act of aggravated criminality in those who are the guardians of morals and Religion, and are "set for the defence" of the truth.

Such a doctrine is Universalism, both in its Modern and Ancient form; and to the present attempt to arrest it in its course, and caution the

unwary, the Writer has been impelled by a sense of imperative obligation. Most conscientiously believing Universalism to be at once, the most plausible, and ruinous to the souls of men, of all the schemes invented by the agency of the Infernal Spirit to deceive the nations, and people the regions of everlasting woe,—and painfully conscious of the actually sad workings of this diabolical system in the utter ruin of the hopes and happiness of many of his fellow-men,—he looks upon it as a duty he owes to his God, to the Christian church, and the public generally, to expose the fallacy of the boasted doctrine of Universal salvation or Universal Restoration, by exhibiting its absolute irreconcileabity with the entire system of Revealed Truth,—Others, before him, have toiled in the same honorable employment; but as their publications are not in general circulation in these Provinces, something of a popular character to meet the exigencies of the community is still deemed necessary, —to supply which the present work has been prepared.

In the course of his enquiries, it will be seen, he has availed himself of the helps, which other Writers on Universalism, and commentators, generally, afford;—the assistance thus derived is duly acknowledged. Their remarks are quoted, sometimes to confirm the writer's own opinion, and at other times, to place subjects of doctrine and criticism in new, varied and impressive

points of view, so that in the mouths of numeous witnesses the truth may be established.

In a few instances he has yielded to a little playfulness of fancy; with no intention, however, of exciting a spirit of levity on so solemn a subject as that which involves the eternal destiny of men, but solely, to expose the extreme folly of the lofty pretensions of the Universalist system.

To convince of his error a thorough Universalist, so as to cause him to abandon it, is almost a hopeless task. In not a few instances, it is to be feared, persons of this faith, are given over to "strong delusion that th y should believe a lie." By such, Truth, tho' supported by the whole weight of scripture-testimony, is despised: on their wilfully perverted understandings and obdurated hearts it makes no deep, no permanent impression:—the consequences of such perversity and obduration, fearful and dismaying as they are, must be borne by themselves under circumstances of hopeless remedy.—Sufficient, however, it is thought, is contained in the following pages, to satisfy the enquiries of every sincere seeker after truth and to assure him of the falsity of Universalism. To all such, and the community generally, the present publication is now committed, with an earnest desire, that it may be rendered instrumental, under the Divine blessing, of reclaiming, if possible, such as have wandered

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER V.

Preliminaries which the Restorationists must first establish before they can derive any advantage from criticism on disputed terms--absurdities involved in their belief, 53—58.

CHAPTER VI.

Scriptures cannot contain contradictory doctrines—The Future state of Punishment, shown from the Scriptures, not to be a state of discipline or trial—Universalism, the offspring of the Devil, and to be rejected, 59—84.

CHAPTER VII.

Means are not used in the future state for the purification of damned spirits and for their restoration to the favour and image of God—not the punishment itself—Penal sufferings not corrective but the contrary, 85—100.

CHAPTER VIII.

Same subject continued—The Word of God, Read or Preached, not a means used for the recovery of the damned—nor the sanctified efforts of the Pious—nor the Mediatorial and Intercessory offices of Christ—nor the influence of the Holy Spirit—Objection, that God can work without as well as with means, answered, 101—115.

CHAPTER IX.

Objections from 1 Pet. iii. 18—20—1 Pet. iv. 6. and 1 Cor. iii. 15. answered, 116—124.

CHAPTER X.

The doctrine that the design of the means, if any, to be hereafter used is to restore the souls of the damned to the kingdom of heaven, shewn to be unscriptural, 125—134.

CHAPTER XI.

If means are used in the eternal world for saving purposes, there is no reason to believe, that, in every instance, they will prove effectual—in hell, there is no freedom of the will to good, 135—146.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER XII.

Argument from the benevolence of God as being inconsistent with eternal punishment refuted—annihilation not the punishment of the wicked, and is opposed by Universalism—Recapitulation, 147—152.

CHAPTER XIII.

Passages explained viz :—Gen. xii. 3—Ps. xxii. 27.—Ps. lxviii. 9.—Is. lvii. 16.—Eek. xvi. 55.—Matt. xvii. 11.—Acts iii. 21.—Rom. v. 18—Rom. xiv 9.—1 Cor. xv. 22.—1 Cor. xv. 24.—1 Cor. xv. 25. 28.—1 Cor. xv. 26.—Coloss. i. 20.—Philip ii. 10. 11.—1 John iii. 8.—Rev. v.13.—Rev. xxi. 4.—conclusion.153—163.

N. B. The reader will observe that the first line page 107 is placed first page 111. See Errata.

UNIVERSALISM UNSCRIPTURAL.

CHAPTER I.

ON HELL, AS A PLACE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT. THE MEANINGS OF SHEOL, HADES, AND GEHENNA, CONSIDERED.

As this work professes to contain a refutation of Modern and Ancient Universalism, it will be necessary briefly to state, that the Ancient Universalists were the advocates of a *limited* future punishment, embracing the doctrine of the final *restoration* to eternal happiness in heaven *of all lapsed intelligencies;* but the Modern Universalists, as contradistinguished from the former, believe in *no future punishment whatever,* asserting that all men are punished in *this world* for their sins, and, on death, are *immediately received to everduring felicity.* Both opinions, however, are entertained by numerous persons at the present day :—the term "modern" is given to distinguish the *later* modification of Universalism from the *former,*—not with the intention of conveying the idea that all the Universalists of the present age are *unanimous* in their rejection of a future limited punishment.

For the sake of method we shall commence with the opinions of the moderns.

The reader must not be surprised to learn that the "Modern Universalists" boldly and roundly affirm that the words rendered *Hell* in *no one place*, either in the *Old* or *New* Testament, signify a *place* of *punishment*. The *boldness* with which they make the assertion is doubtless equalled only by the *ignorance* which gives it birth. The fact is, they go here on a principle of extremely erroneous interpretation:—because the word or words, now in question, do not *in every instance*, mean a place of future misery, they at once conclude they have this meaning in *no one instance*. The folly of such a mode of interpretation need scarcely to be remarked upon. By the same method, we might prove that man has no soul, no immaterial, immortal, intelligent principle; for the word *soul*, in the Scriptures is sometimes used for *animal life;* —thus the Psalmist says, "Let the enemies persecute my *soul* and take it"—let him take away my *life;* and it has been well observed, that, "by the same mode of reasoning, it might be proved, that there is *no place of happiness* for the righteous in the future world, for the term *heaven* is often used to denote only the *regions of the atmosphere*. Thus the Scriptures speak of the *fowls* of heaven; the *rain* of heaven; and of *Mount Sinai burning* in the midst of heaven." Nothing therefore can be more fallacious than this mode of interpretation; for by it a person may make words speak whatever he please, as almost all words have various meanings.

The words translated "*hell*" in the Scriptures are *Sheol*, Hebrew; *Hades*, also *Gehenna*, Greek.

The word *Sheol* is derived from the verb *Shal*, which signifies to *ask*, *require*, *desire*, and has different meanings.

Sometimes it signifies the *grave*. Thus Jacob says, "I will go down into the *grave*, unto my son, mourning;" Gen xxxvii. 35. And the Psalmist "Let death seize upon them, and let them go down quick into *hell*," into the *grave*. Ps. l. 15.

It is also used as a *general name of the invisible world*, the *place of departed spirits*, whether good or evil, happy or miserable. "With respect to the Hebrew term Sheol, the learned VITRINGA remarks on the celebrated passage in ISAIAH, (xiv. 9:) which LOWTH translates

> "Hades [Sheol] from beneath is moved, because
> Of thee, to meet thee at thy coming;
> He rouseth for thee the mighty dead, all the
> Great chiefs of the earth; [the *Rephaim*,
> *Shades* or *Manes;*]"

that though the word is used, for the *grave* or *sepulchre*, it cannot be so taken in this passage, that it is here the *place of the souls of men released from* the body by death; and that this *entire region* was called by the Jews *Sheol*, by the Greeks *Hades*, and by the Latins *Inferi*."

The word *Sheol*, likewise denotes a *place of future punishment*. If not, why should it be something predicated exclusively of the future state of the *wicked*? Or why should it be something *threatened* ONLY to those who live and die in a state of disobedience? When used to signify the *grave*, or the *general abode of departed spirits*, it may be applied to the *righteous* with the same propriety as to the *wicked*. But there are passages, in which it is applied to the wicked *only*, and thus also in the way of *threatening*, or *emphatic declaration of their awful condition;* and in such passages the word *Sheol*, must have a meaning *beyond* either of the two first assigned,—a meaning expressive of the *future punishment* and *misery* of the wicked, so repeatedly asserted in other portions of the word of God. Thus, the *wicked* shall be turned into *hell*, *Sheol*, and all the *nations* that *forget God*." Ps. ix. 17. This verse we apprehend fully proves our point. Certain characters are here specified, the "wicked" and "the nations that forget God"—a certain threatening is denounced as bearing exclusively on their future state, they "shall be turned into *Hell*."

Now, if the word *Sheol*, hell, means here only the *sepulchre* or the *place of separate spirits*, then there is nothing more said of the characters mentioned, than might be said of the *most holy* and *obedient*. The *latter* as well as the *former* go to the *grave*, the house appointed for all living, and their *souls* enter into the *future, spiritual* and *invisible world*. On this principle of interpretation, what object had the Psalmist in view in uttering this solemn declaration? If he only referred to the common lot of men, whether good or evil, why fix his attention exclusively on the "*wicked*?" Why single out "the nations that *forget* God?" Why use, in this case, the very strange expression, "shall be *turned* into *hell*," evidently implying something more than the mere placing the body in the grave, or the entrance of the soul into the future world? Was a similar form of expression ever employed in reference to the *good*? Can a passage be found in the whole range of revealed truth to this effect. "The *righteous* shall be *turned* into *hell* and *all the nations* that *obediently remember* God?" No: but we read, as marking an essential difference between them,—"The wicked is *driven away* in his wickedness: BUT the righteous hath *hope in his death*." Prov. xiv. 32.—Psalm ix. 17, therefore, if it have any meaning at all, must refer to the *future miserable* locality of the characters described.

"Her feet go down to death, her steps take hold on *hell*, Sheol." Prov. v. 5. Now this also is spoken of a *wicked character*;—is something which peculiarly and exclusively belongs to this character, and *cannot*, with the the least truth or propriety, apply to its *opposite*. But if *Sheol* means here only the *grave*, or *place* of *departed spirits*, it will apply with the same force to the most *virtuous*, as to the most *abandoned* character. Agreeably to this rendering, there is nothing here but might, with equal truth, be affirmed of every daughter of Eve, whe-

ther *pious* or otherwise ; for each and every one of them is tending to the tomb and to the eternal world. If this were all the "Wise Man" intended to say, why caution his "Son" against the "strange woman" by the *motives* he has employed ?—On the Modern Universalist belief, that there is *no hell*, of misery, but all are happy the moment they enter futurity, there is no force, no propriety, in these motives; but Solomon, if possessed of the *wisdom* of our modern Universalist Divines, should have exhorted his "Son" directly the reverse ; for speedy death, would be speedy glory. Sheol, therefore, in this verse, has a *further* meaning than the two first assigned, and is expressive of a place of *future torment.*

The same reasoning will apply to Prov. ix. 18. "But he (the simple) knoweth not that the dead (*ghosts*) are there, and that her guests are in the *depths of hell*, Sheol."

Prov. xxiii. 14. is equally explicit, "Thou shalt beat him with a rod, and shalt deliver his *soul* from *Sheol, hell.*" Here "hell" cannot mean the *grave* or *place of departed spirits.* Not the *grave ;* for the "wise man" speaks not of the *body*, but of the *soul*, and none will contend that the *soul* is *buried* and *remains in the tomb ;* and tho' we acknowledge, that when, in the preceding verse, he says, "if thou beatest him with the rod he shall not *die*," he means, that correction may be the means of turning the child from those courses which, if persisted in, might lead to *speedy natural death*, yet, in the verse in question, he is speaking of a different thing entirely. Correction, sanctified, may not only prevent immediate natural death, but may be also the means of saving the "*soul*" of the child from a "hell" of *punishment*, a *place of future suffering.* This appears to be the meaning of Solomon.--The term *Sheol*, in this verse cannot mean the *place of departed spirits.* For in no proper sense can it be said, that correction can deliver the *soul* from it.

Whether bodily chastisement be sanctified or not, the soul must enter the spiritual world. There is no alternative; and if *sheol* here convey no idea of a place of punishment hereafter,—if, as it is so strenuously asserted by the Modern Universalists, immediate happiness await the *wicked* as well as the good, at the termination of their natural life, it is certainly somewhat marvellous that the "wise man" should recommend *present flagellation* as a means, to keep back the soul from this *future happiness*.

"Thus as STUART observes in his 'Essay on Future Punishment,' while the Old Testament employs *Sheol*, in most cases, to designate the grave, the region of the dead, the place of departed spirits, it employs it also, in some cases, to designate along with this idea of the adjunct one of the place of misery, place of punishment, region of woe." (1)

The Greek word "Hades," from *a* negative and *idein* to *see*, in its primary sense signifies *obscure, invisible*, and is synonomous with the Hebrew *Sheol*.

Hades is sometimes used in the New Testament to designate the grave. Thus,—O death where is thy sting? O *grave, hadē*, where is thy victory?" 1 Cor. xv. 55.

It is sometimes used to point out *the invisible place* or *state of separate souls in general*. "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and *hell* (*hades*) deliver up the dead which were in them." Rev. xx. 13. (2)

Hades, like *Sheol*, also signifies a *place of future torment*. Thus,—"The rich man also died, and in *hell* (*hade*) he lift up his eyes, *being in torments*." Luke xvi. 23. Surely no person can be so obstinately perverse, or so immersed in prejudice, as to contend, that *hades* in this verse, means only the *grave*, or *general place of departed spirits*. If so, why is the exegetical phrase added, "*being*

(1) R. Watson's Theol. Dic. *sub voce* "*Hell.*"
(2) See this verse explained at large Chapter vi.

in torments"? Why the application to Abraham for *relief* ?—What ! did he want relief from *happiness* ? Was the "Rich Man" so *burning* with *love*, so *fired* with *delights*, that he could not contain himself, and wanted a *drop of water* to *cool* his *fervour*, and *diminish* the *flame* ?—O ye glowing Seraphs, so near the ever-resplendent Throne, so high in the climes of glory and felicity,—why do ye not *complain*, and *agonizingly cry* for an *ocean of water* to *cool* your *holy*, *heavenly ardours* ?—If *hades* never signifies a place of misery, and if both saint and sinner, at death, equally and immediately enter into heaven, —why was the case of Dives *contrasted*, with that of Lazarus ?—Why is it said, that in *this life*, Lazarus received his *evil things* (sufferings) and the "Rich Man" his *good things*, (worldly comforts and pleasures) and that in the *future state* Lazarus is *comforted*, and the rich man *tormented* ? And why, on the modern Universalist principle, was Dives so *very solicitous* that his *five brethren*, should *not* "also come into this place of" *happiness* ? Did he wish to enjoy all his *comfort* alone? Or had he shut up the *bowels of his compassion* against them and *hardened his heart* with *ravishing delights* ? If there be no *distinction* of place in the future world,—if no hell of suffering, if when sinners die, they, with the righteous, are immediately enwrapped to the "Paradise" of God, where then, we ask, would the "five brethren," find, at death, their "destined place ?"—Dives wished them not to be in the *same place* with him ;—i. e. according to the *modern* interpretation, *in heaven* ?—Into what *other* place then could they go, on the termination of natural life, if there be but *one* place of happiness hereafter. The extreme of happiness and of infelicity is not more opposite, than this entire passage is to the notions of Modern Universalism, and if it prove not the reality of a place of future misery, there is not a verse in the Bible which proves the reality of a place of future happiness.

Gehenna, is another term used by the Sacred writers and translated *hell;* and here we may remark, that it commonly, if not invariably, denotes the *place of the damned.*

"It is a corruption of the two Hebrew words *Ge*, *a valley*, and *Hinnom*, the name of a person who was once the possessor of it. This *valley of Hinnom* lay near Jerusalem, and had been the place of those abominable sacrifices in which the idolatrous Jews burned their children alive to *Molech*, *Baal*, or *the Sun.*"—(3) It afterward became the receptacle of the filth of Jerusalem, which was consumed by continual fires.

Now when punishment in *Gehenna* is threatened, the Modern Universalists refer it to an actual suffering in the valley of Hinnom, and assert that no future suffering whatever is intended. This is a very easy, but a very fallacious method of setting aside future punishment.

It is evident, that neither the Jews, nor our blessed Lord, nor his Apostles, undertood the term in this way, nor did they give it this application. That they looked upon the valley of Hinnom, with its abominations and fires, and worms, as a striking *emblem* of *hell*, with its quenchless fire and deathless worm, is acknowledged. But that they regarded the one as synonymous with the other may well be denied. "From this valley's having been the scene of those *infernal sacrifices*, and probably too from its *continuing* after the time of king Josiah's reformation, (2 Kings xxiii. 10) a place of abominable *filthiness* and *pollution;* the Jews, in our Saviour's time, used the compound word *Ge Hinnom* for *hell*, the *place of the damned.* This appears from that word being thus applied by the CHALDEE TARGUMS on Ruth ii. 12. Ps. cxl. 12. Isa. xxvi. 15—xxxiii. 14. &c. and by the JERUSALEM

(3) Parkhurst's Greek Lex. *sub voce Gehenna.*

Targum, and that of Jonathan Ben Uziel, on Gen. iii. 24—xv. 17. Conp. ii. Esdras, Apocryph. ii. 20." (4)

Speaking of *gehenna*, a sensible writer observes,—"This word, I know, has been frittered away by Universalists, to mean only a valley in the vicinity of Jerusalem. But how was it used by our Saviour? and how was it understood by the Jews who heard his discourses? I answer, with no fear of contradiction from any intelligent student of the Bible, that the Saviour always used this term to denote the place of future punishment; and that it was uniformly understood in this sense by the Jews of his time. It is a word *peculiar* to the Jews, and was employed by them some time before the coming of Christ to denote that part of *Sheol* which was the habitation of the wicked after death. This is proved by the fact of its being found in the Apocryphal books, and Jewish Targums, some of which were written before the time of our Saviour. These Targums were translations and interpretations of the Scriptures. Three of these Targums, in remarking upon various passages of the Old Testament, use the word *Gehenna*, and *expressly explain it to mean* the *place of future punishment for the wicked*. If then our Saviour did not use this word in a totally different sense from that in which it was used by the persons whom he addressed, he must have employed it to denote the place of future punishment. And that he did thus use it, must be evident to any one who considers the passages in which the word occurs." (5)

To convict the Universalists of uttering a *positive* and *shameless untruth*, in stating that the word *hell* in the Scriptures, in no one passage, denotes a *place* of future misery, it is not necessary to adduce all the instances in which the word *Gehenna* is found:—some of them, however, will now be advanced, abundantly sufficient for this purpose.

(4) Parkhurst's G. Lex. *sub voce.*
(5) Letters against Universalism.

"And if the right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not that thy whole body should be cast into *hell, gehennan.*" Matt. v. 29—also repeated v. 30.

Our Lord is here cautioning his disciples against the indulgence of *impure desires;* and it is evident he does not enforce his caution by any *Jewish mode of external punishment.* He does not therefore refer to any suffering in the *valley of Hinnom;* for the Jews never punished persons, in any way, for the *desires of the heart,* however impure, for a good reason, they are not cognizable to man; and, besides this, their religion was outward. The religion of Christ is spiritual and reaches to the inward workings of the soul as well as to the exterior demeanour:—he, therefore, urges his disciples to forego even the *desire* of forbidden pleasures, as this will subject the indulging parties to future suffering in *hell,* as certainly as the outward act.

"And fear not them which *kill the body,* but are *not able* to kill *the soul:* but rather fear him which is able to *destroy* both *soul* and *body* in *hell, geennē.*" Matt. x. 48.

A more fatal passage, than this to the scheme we are opposing, the Universalists never need wish to encounter. To be convinced of this, it is only necessary to read it with their gloss. "Fear not them (men) which kill the *body,* but are *not able* to kill the *soul*: but rather fear him (God) which is able to *destroy* both *soul* and *body* in the *valley of Hinnom!*" The *destruction* of the *soul* as well as the *body* is spoken of in the text. Now we should like to be informed,—what kind of *destruction* the soul can suffer in the valley of Hinnom? Again, whether there is any account of God's having *destroyed,* or punished, any *soul* in this valley? Again, whether it be possible for the Diety himself to punish the soul, or inflict pain upon it, by the mere agency of natural fire applied

to the body? Or in any other words can an *immaterial* principle receive punishment from the operation of a *natural* agent? You might as well attempt to horse-whip a spirit as to burn it with fire; or to drown it in water as to suffocate it with smoke. Observe—the contrast, in this verse, is between the *body* and the *soul*, and the power of *man* and the power of *God*. Man may kill the body, but cannot touch the soul: God can destroy, punish, *both* in hell. But if *gehenna* here only mean the valley of Hinnom, and if the mere suffering there constitute hell, why may not *man* destroy both body and soul there as well as God? Again:—It is evident that the command of our Lord, and the motives by which he enforced it, did not refer to the first disciples exclusively, but to others of succeeding ages to the end of time. Now we would ask the Universalists, if *gehenna* here only mean the *valley of Hinnom*, whether persons of the *present day* who fall under the displeasure of God, will be punished body and soul, in the valley of Hinnom? Lastly:—if it be true that man cannot kill the soul, and the *fires* of the valley can *only* kill the *body*, then some other punishment is referred to than that of burning there; because, it is expressly said, God is able to destroy the *soul* as well as the *body*, *in* hell. Hell therefore, in the text, does not mean the *valley of Hinnom*, but a *place of future suffering*.

"Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him two fold more the *child of hell*, *geennes*, than *yourselves*." Matt. xxiii. 15. Read the latter part of the verse according to the Universalist system, and admire its profundity of sense. "Ye make him two fold more the *child of the valley of Hinnom* than yourselves"! Poor Poole! Henry! Wesley! Whitby! Doddridge! Benson! Scott! Clarke! Watson! what pity it is, ye had not the *profound wisdom* of some of our

Modern Divines! What discoveries ye might have made! How invaluable might ye have rendered your now, Alas! no longer learned Commentaries! "A child of hell, *uion geennes*, is one like Satan in his disposition, and doomed to the same punishment."(6) Were the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* children of the valley of Hinnom?—for they are included in the condemnatory sentence as well as the proselyte.

"Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the *damnation of hell, geennes.*" Matt. xxiii. 33.

According to the Universalist Commentators, this would read, "how can ye escape the *damnation* of the *Valley of Hinnom*"! Now our Lord is here addressing the Scribes and Pharisees, and his question is equivalent to the declaration, *Ye cannot escape.* We ask, then, our *learned friends*, if all, to whom our Lord on this occasion addressed himself, were really *damned* in the *Valley of Hinnom*? Can they show satisfactorily that even *one* individual of the respected and honored orders of the Scribes and Pharisees suffered in this valley any punishment to which the word *damnation* can with propriety apply?—Let them produce their proof, or acknowledge the folly of saying. that, when punishment in hell is asserted in the New Testament, all that is meant is, suffering in this abominable valley. "Here, too, the punishment is stated: it is that of *geenna, the fire of hell*, which *figuratively* denotes the terribleness of that visitation which overwhelmed their City and nation in unheard of calamities, and *literally* the punishment to which they individually rendered themselves obnoxious in *a future state.* The phrase, "the judgment of damnation of hell," often occurs in the Talmud for future torment, and the everlasting wrath of God."(7)

Our remarks on this subject might be extended to a greater length; but what has been advanced, we appre-

(6) R. Watson. (7) R. Watson *in loc.*

hend, contains a sufficiency of Scripture and argument to refute the fallacious and dangerous notion, that, the word "*hell*," in *no one* instance signifies a *place of future punishment*. To the advocates of this opinion we would take the liberty of saying, "it is easier *said* than *proved*."

Chapter II.

The Question considered whether men receive in this world all the punishment which their sins deserve.

That sin deserves punishment of some kind is universally acknowledged: but as to the *place* and *duration* of this punishment a difference of opinion exists. The modern Universalists, as we before remarked, believe in no future punishment whatever, but confine the punishment of sinners altogether to this world. *Adverse Providences*, and *remorse of conscience*, they assert, are *all the hell*, all the *punishment* men are required to suffer; and as these are endured in this life, no further demands of divine justice await them hereafter; but death is to all men the entrance into everlasting felicity in heaven. Hence, on this system, *future* punishment can have no existence:—it is a nonentity:—men never were exposed to it, and, if inflicted, it would be an act of the most flagrant injustice. The question we now propose to consider is—

Do men so receive in this world the punishment of their sins, as to render future punishment altogether uncalled for and unjust?

The Modern Universalists answer this query affirmatively: we deny it and appeal to the Scriptures.

Our ultimate appeal in the settlement of this important question must be to the decisions of the Sacred Scriptures, for God alone can decide upon the criminality of sin, and the nature, degree, and duration of its punishment; and as He is a God of Wisdom and Justice, He cannot inflict any punishment on guilty offenders which is truly unnecessary and unjust. To suppose the contrary, would be to suppose that God is at one and the same time both infinitely wise and infinitely foolish, infinitely just and infinitely unjust,—a supposition, which is not only absurd but blasphemous. The Bible contains the revelation of God's will; hence, if we find, in his written word, that *there is* a *future* punishment, and that the contrary belief is opposed to all the *fundamental doctrines* of the Christian Revelation, then we must believe, on the Divine Authority, that, not only the affirmative side of the question at issue is positively untrue, but also that future punishment is both necessary and just. These observations the reader is requested to bear in mind as he proceeds in the discussion.

It may not be unprofitable to give the *reason* of the case in favour of our position. The following is from a Master's hand, and is with confidence submitted to the reader's careful attention:—the inferences are borne out by the Sacred Volume.

"Men are capable of committing sin, and sin is productive of misery and disorder. These positions cannot be denied. That to violate the laws of God, and to despise his authority, are not light crimes, is clear from considering them in their general effect upon society, and upon the world. Remove from the human race all the effects produced by vice, direct and indirect; all the inward and outward miseries and calamities which are entirely evitable by mankind and which they wilfully bring upon themselves and others; and scarcely a sigh would be heaved, or a groan heard, except those extorted by

natural evils, (small comparatively in number,) throughout the whole earth. The great sum of human misery is the effect of actual offence; and as it is a principle in the wisest and most perfect human legislation to estimate the guilt of individual acts by their general tendency, and to proportion the punishment to them under that consideration, the same reason of the case is in favour of this principle, as found in Scripture; and thus considered, the demerit of the sins of an individual against God becomes incalculable. Nor is there any fonndation to suppose, that the punishment assigned to sin by the judicial appointment of the Supreme Governor is confined to the *present life;* for before we can determine that, we must be able to estimate the demerit of an act of wilful transgression in its principle, habits, and influence, which, *as parties implicated*, we are not in a state of feeling or judgment to attempt, were the subject more within our grasp. But the obvious reason of the case is in favour of the doctrine of *future punishment*, for not only is there an unequal administration of punishments in the present life, so that many eminent offenders pass through the present state without any visible manifestation of the Divine displeasure against their conduct, but there are also strong and convincing proofs that we are placed in a state of trial, which continues *throughout life*, and the *result* of which can only be known, and consequently we ourselves can only become subjects of final reward or punishment after existence in this world terminates. From the circumstances we have just enumerated to indicate the kind of government which is exercised over the human race, we must conclude, that, allowing the Supreme Governor to be wise and just, benevolent and holy, men are neither treated as innocent nor as incorrigibly corrupt. Now, what reason can possibly be given for this mixed kind of administration, but that the moral improvement of man is the object intended by it? The severity discounten-

ances and restrains vice : the annexation of inward felicity in all cases, (and outward in all those instances in which the result depends upon the conduct of the individual,) to holy habits and acts, recommends and sanctions them, and allures to the use of those means which God has provided for enabling us to form and practise them. No other final causes, it would appear, can be assigned for the peculiar manner in which we are governed in the present life: and if the deterring and correcting severity on the one hand, and the alluring and instructive kindness on the other, which mark the Divine administration, continue throughout life; if, in every period of his life here, man is capable, by the use of the prescribed means, of forming new habits and renouncing old ones, and thus of accomplishing the purposes of the moral discipline under which he is placed; then is he in a state of trial throughout life; and if so, he is *accountable for the whole course of his life*, and his *ultimate reward* or *punishment* must be *in a state subsequent* to the present. (8)

The certainty of future punishment is rendered indubitable by the positive declarations of Scripture. To prove this proposition it is not necessary to adduce all the passages which teach this important truth: a few are sufficient for our purpose.

" And do ye not know their tokens, that the wicked is *reserved* to the *day of destruction*? they shall be brought forth to the *day of wrath*." Job. xxi. 29, 30.

The testimony of Job, on this subject, is worthy of especial regard, as he was contending against the very doctrine we are opposing, that is, that sinners receive their punishment in this life. His friends supposed he had been guilty of some aggravated crimes otherwise the Deity had never suffered him to be so afflicted; and endeavoured to convince him of the truth of their accusations

(8) Watson's Institutes, Vol. 1. 228—230.

by a reference to the Providential government of God, which they contended invariably punishes the guilty in this world. Job repelled the charge and alleged, that the righteous were not always prosperous, nor the wicked in a state of adversity; but that whilst the former were to look forward to another state for their reward, the latter, though now in prosperity, were *reserved to the day of destruction*, and should, *in a future state*, receive the punishment of their sins.

"And these" (the wicked) "shall go away into everlasting punishment." Matt. xxv. 46.

We lay no stress, in our present argument, on the adjective "everlasting"; but quote the passage to show that the wicked *after* the "Judgment day", "go away into *punishment*," consequently into *future* punishment.

"The rich man also *died*, and *was buried*, and *in hell*, he lift up his eyes, *being in torments*." Luke xvi. 22, 23,

This passage is very express:—it was not until he had *died*, that his soul was turned *into hell*, and was *tormented*. His enjoyments in *this life*, and his sufferings in the future world, are also *contrasted* in the 25th verse:—so as to exclude all idea of his having been punished in this world for his sins.

"But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself *wrath* against the *day of wrath* and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who *will* render" (in the day of judgment) "to every man according to his deeds."—Rom. ii. 5. 6.

The scene of this day of wrath, and rendering unto men according to their conduct, is removed *beyond* the period of this life; and the punishment of the wicked must therefore be future.

"The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to *reserve* the unjust until the day of judgment *to be punished*." 2 Pet. ii. 9.

"But these shall utterly perish in their own corruption;

and shall receive the reward of unrighteousness: to whom the mist of darkness is *reserved* for ever." Ib. 12, 13, 17.

"Wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever." Jude 13.

Those passages need no comment. We would however observe that the future happiness of the pious is spoken of as being "*reserved*" for them, which shows in what sense we are to take the term in the above quotations,—that it refers entirely, to the *future* world. See Peter, i. 3—5.

"When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, &c. who *shall be punished*," &c.—1 Thess. i. 7—10. No man, in his senses, can refer the sublime scene referred to in these verses, to any other period than that of Christ's coming in visible majesty and glory to "judge the world in righteousness," and reward his friends and punish his enemies.

There is then a future punishment of the wicked; but whether or not that punishment is *eternal* is a question for subsequent consideration.

To this conclusion the Modern Universalists demur, and to show that the "wicked" receive all their punishment in this world, they quote Prov. xi. 31, "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth: much more the wicked and the sinner."

But we ask, does this verse contain the *rule*, which the Deity *invariably* observes in his conduct to men? Is it a rule from which there is no exception? Are the "righteous *always* recompensed in the earth"? Are the "wicked and the sinner" *always* punished during the present life? Or does the "wise man" here only intend to say, that *sometimes* the righteous shall receive in this world especial tokens of Providential good, and the wicked and the sinner on the other hand, shall not always escape with im-

punity from Providential calamities, but shall sometimes receive in this world particular demonstrations of the Divine displeasure;—not at all, however, in either case, superseding the *future* reward of the one and the *future* punishment of the other? The latter is doubtless the true meaning of the passage, harmonizing with *other parts of Scripture, the actual providences of God,* and the *experience of mankind.*

If the former meaning be contended for as the true one, then this verse proves too much, and therefore proves nothing at all. The verse must be taken as a whole, and on the assumed principle of the Universalists, it proves, that the *righteous* receive *all* their recompence of reward in this life, and have no interest in any future inheritance, as much as it proves, that the wicked and the sinner receive *all* their recompence of punishment *in this life,* and have no future sufferings to endure. They must take the verse with all its consequences: or give up their principle of interpretation as being *false,* or this verse fails to serve the cause for the support of which, it is adduced.

Let us test the Universalist construction of this passage by *Scripture and experience.*

We first observe, that if there be any meaning in this view of it, this verse proves that the *righteous* are, in this world, free from all kinds of *sufferings* and *distress;* that God, in his providence, *always* smiles upon them; that they are continually prosperous, and have *at all times,* the advantage of the wicked: all this, and much more, enters into the idea of their being "*recompensed* in the earth."

On the contrary, this verse, on the principle of construction above assumed, proves, if it prove, what it is called to do, that the *wicked* are *always* in suffering and distress; that God in his providence, *always* frowns upon them; that they are continually in adversity; that their circumstances are always *inferior* to those of the righ-

teous; and that they *ever* suffer, while life lasts, extreme *agonies of mind*, by reason of a guilty, and *condemning conscience:* all this at least, is included in the idea of their being "*much more* recompensed in the earth"—for it must be acknowledged, that being "wicked", unrenewed, they *sin continually*, and deserve *punishment continually*, and, that, wherever inflicted, "*indignation* and *wrath*, *tribulation* and *anguish* shall be upon *every* soul of man that doeth evil."

Let us then bring this doctrine to the test of the *Scriptures*. The question is, do the Scriptures teach it? Do they give us such account of the righteous and the wicked? By no means.

They give us other views of the *present* state of the *righteous*:—"The Lord trieth the righteous," Ps. xi. 5. "*Many* are the *afflictions* of the righteous. Ps. xxxiv. 19. In the world ye shall have *tribulation*." John xvi. 33. "We must through *much tribulation* enter into the kingdom of God." Acts xiv. 22. "If *in this life only* we have hope in Christ, *we* are of *all men most miserable*." 1 Cor. xv. 19.

The Scriptures give us other views of the *present* state of the *wicked*. "Wherefore do the wicked live, become old, yea, are *mighty in power*? Their houses are safe from fear, *neither is the rod of God upon them*." Job xxi 7, 9. "I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked. For there are no bands in their death. They are not in *trouble as other men;* neither are they *plagued* like *other men*. They have *more* than heart could wish. Behold these are the ungodly who prosper in the world, they increase in riches." Ps. lxxii. 3—12.

The following passages bear also upon the argument. "There be just men unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked: again there be wicked men, to whom it happeneth according to the work of

the righteous." Eccl. viii. 14. "No man knoweth either *love* or *hatred* (of God) by all that is before them." by his providential arrangements. "All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked; to the good, and to the clean, and to the unclean. As is the good so is the sinner." Ib. ix. 1 2. "For he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." Matt. v. 45.

As it regards the *agonies of conscience*, said to be endured by the wicked in this life, as a punishment of their sins, we would observe that the *Scriptures* represent even some of the greatest offenders as having a conscience *void of all sensibility* and consequently of *remorse*. "In the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to *seducing spirits*, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; *having their conscience seared with a hot iron.*" 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2. So far from suffering remorse of conscience, the wicked cry to themselves "*peace* and *safety*," tho' "sudden destruction cometh upon them"; from which "they shall not escape." 1 Thess. v. 3. Instead, also, of representing the wicked of his day, as suffering for their sins the agonies of conscience, Jeremiah represents them as being *happy*, which, at least implies the *absence* of *mental pain*. "Wherefore doth the way of the wicked *prosper*?" "Wherefore are all they *happy* that deal very treacherously?" Jer. xii. 1. The Scriptures describe sin as being of a *deceitful* and *hardening* nature; and consequently the longer a person lives in the practice of sin, his heart becomes the more hardened, his moral sensibilities are the more benumbed, and his conscience is the less susceptible of pain. "Exhort one other daily, while it is to day; lest any of you be *hardened* through the *deceitfulness* of sin." Heb. iii. 13. Hence we are informed of some, "who being *past feeling* have given themselves over unto

lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness." Eph. iv. 19.

Whilst such passages as these, are on the sacred page, we cannot embrace the unfounded dogma, that *remorse of conscience* in this world, constitutes the punishment of sinners;—for remorse of conscience is not a *punishment at all*, at least not one proceeding directly from God;—remorse of conscience implies the commission of sin, and the reception of divine light; without this light conscience could not discover sin and be sensible of pain. An awakened or alarmed conscience in this world, proves the existence of divine influence instead of the presence of punishment. Hence this remorse of conscience exists more or less in every penitent; and, in nine cases out of ten, it is this state of mind, produced by the Divine Spirit, that leads persons to enquire "*What must we do to be saved?*"—It cannot therefore be a punishment.

But this tenderness of conscience may be slighted; the Spirit that produced it may be grieved; the light may be withdrawn; and the heart may lose its moral feeling, and be rendered increasingly obdurate by long habits, and continual practice, of sin.

Hence we reject the above dogma, as being unscriptural, as it leaves the punishment of the offender in *his own hands*, and not in God's. If remorse is awakened, by sin he may immediately allay it; he has the remedy in his own power, and may escape the alledged punishment altogether. Nor must it be forgotten that, on this principle the greatest offender is oftentimes the least sufferer, and the punishment is proportioned not to the greatness but to the smallness of the crimes. For the smallest offender oftentimes from the tenderness of his conscience suffers more anguish of mind than the greatest adept in wickedness, who has been long hackneyed in the ways of vice. Now the scriptures represent the punishment as coming from God, and that men are punished "according to

their deeds," not indeed in this world, but in the world to come. The Universalist dogma is therefore unscriptural.

Experience, also, is as fatal to the doctrine now condemned as the Scriptures are.

That the *righteous* do not receive their *reward here*, or even that they are not always *free* from *suffering* and enjoy *uninterrupted prosperity*, is a fact attested by the experience of almost every, if not every, saint who has ever lived. Reference to individuals is not necessary:—the knowledge of the reader can supply innumerable instances in proof of our assertion.

Experience is equally against the supposition that *sinners* receive their *full punishment* here, or, as the verse in question is supposed to imply, that the Providential government of God invariably indicates the Divine displeasure against the wicked. Admit that some particular crimes or indulgences may be productive of bodily suffering; yet that all sins are not thus visited is a matter of daily observation. Are there now no affluent sinners free from bodily disease and pain?—Are there none basking in the beams of an external prosperity, surrounded by every thing that can minister to their gratification, who are strangers to God, and enemies of the Cross? Are all prosperous persons pious persons, those who "fear God and work righteousness"? Let experience decide.

Nor will the *actual state* of the world sustain the assertion that sinners receive their punishment in the *agonies of their consciences*. Where, we ask, are our PHARISEES, who while they "pay tithe of mint, annise and cummin, neglect the weightier matters of the law," and so far from suffering distress of mind on this account, enjoy a high degree of self-approval and think they are doing God service? Hear St. Paul:—"Men and brethren, I have lived in *all good conscience* before God *until this day*." Acts xxiii. 1. But he "was a *blasphemer* and a *per-*

secutor," during a great part of the time he possessed this *good conscience!* Where was his punishment for these offences?—Not in his *body*, for he did not then appear to labour under any particular bodily indisposition:—but is it not strange, that he suffered many afflictions in his person *after* he had embraced the religion of Christ?—Not in his *conscience*, for his conscience accused him not; yea, he imagined he was materially serving the cause of God! Where also are our SADDUCEES, our EPICUREANS, our INFIDELS, who believe not in the immateriality or immortality of the soul? Who, so far from enduring the remorse of an accusing conscience, think all their business is to "eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow they die!"—We suppose DAVID HUME will be held up as a *victim* of the *excruciating torments* of a *guilty conscience!* Where likewise is that part of our MODERN UNIVERSALISTS themselves, whose amusements are the card-table the ball room—who take God's name in vain by common swearing—who desecrate the Holy Sabbath by parties of pleasure, by business, by the ordinary occupations of the week—who drown their intellects in the intoxicating cup and riot in forbidden pleasures? *What* is their present punishment, and *where* is it sustained? Do they suffer in *conscience*? Let them answer. Yes! we call upon the very persons, who so stoutly aver that remorse of conscience constitutes the punishment of sinners, to declare if they suffer in this way any thing in proportion to the demerit of their sins—whether in fact they have ever hereby *lost their appetite, been rendered unfit for business, deprived of an hour's sleep*, or for a moment *nauseated the pleasures of the world.* If they have any conscience at all, their answer, we are persuaded, will be in the negative. And, indeed, why should they suffer? Do they not ridicule the very idea of *fearing* God? Do they not declare there is no hell—no future punishment whatever—that the moment they die, whatever have been their characters, whe-

ther murderers, or thieves, fornicators or drunkards, swearers or sabbath breakers, contemners of Christ or despisers of religion, they will enter the abodes of purity and blessedness? If all this be true, of what then should these persons be afraid? Of what use is conscience? For what should it mourn? Or on what account should it suffer? All they have to do is, to go on as smoothly as they can—to enjoy as much of carnal delights as possible—and silence the voice of conscience;—then heaven will recompence their crimes!—Before we *swallow this camel*, let us read with prayerful attention the following words; "And it come to pass, when he heareth the words of this curse, that he *bless himself in his heart*, saying, *I shall have peace*, though I *walk in the imagination* of mine heart, to add drunkenness to thirst; the Lord will not spare him, but then the anger of the Lord and his jealousy shall smoke against that man, and all the curses that are written in this book shall lie upon him, and the Lord shall blot out his name from under heaven." Deut. xxix. 19, 20.

Chapter III.

Same subject continued. The assertion, that men are fully punished in this life for their sins proved to be false because it is opposed to some of the fundamental doctrines of divine revelation—such as salvation by the grace of God through a mediator—the probationary character of the present life—a future judgement and future punishment—and the motive to personal godliness derived from fear—Modern Universalism is therefore necessarily destructive to the souls of men.

We have already shown that there is a *place* of future punishment; also a *future punishment itself;* and that men do not receive their punishment in this life in the endurance of *adverse providences* and *remorse of conscience.* Other reasons are not wanting to prove the utter falsity of the contrary notions;—reasons, which must have a powerful weight, with all believers in the Inspired character of the Sacred Volume, in deciding the argument against the Modern Universalists.

We prove the assertion, that *men sustain all the punishment of their sins in this life,* false because

It sets aside Salvation *of the* Grace of God *through a* Mediator.

The Scriptures represent salvation as proceeding from

the *grace* of God *thro' Christ* as a *Divine propitiation*, available to man on the exercise of *faith*. We quote one passage ;—"Being justified freely by his *grace* through the *redemption* that is in *Christ Jesus* ; whom God hath set forth to a propitiation through *faith in his blood*, to declare his righteousness for the *remission of sins that are past*, through the *forbearance* of God ; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness : that he might be *just* and the *justifier* of *him* which *believeth in Jesus*." Rom. iii. 24—26. But the salvation, as it is termed, of the Modern Universalists, is by the *endurance* in this life of the *punishment* of sin to the whole extent of the penalty of the broken law. They do not profess to be *pardoned*, but to *suffer* the whole amount which their sins deserve. What then has the "*grace of God*" to do with this species of *salvation* ? If a man be sentenced for an hour to the pillory for the commission of crime, and he endure the penalty, it is no act of *favour* to liberate him :—he claims his liberation on the score of *justice*. So with the person who suffers in this world the *whole penalty* of the violated law :—it is no act of *grace* that delivers him from suffering :—he claims his deliberation as his *right*. The grace of God, therefore, on this principle, has no part in the salvation of men. Quere—How can such a state of things be reconciled with the following declarations ?—"If thou Lord shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand ?" Ps. cxxx. 3. "Enter not into judgment with thy servant : for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." Ib. cxliii. 2. "How should man be just with God ? If he will contend with him, he cannot answer him one of a thousand." Job. ix. 2. 3. "By grace ye are saved." Eph. ii. 5.

Nor does this salvation proceed from the *merits of Christ*. On the supposition the death of Christ as a Divine Sacrifice, was unnecessary, and on his part only a work of superorogation. For the Universalists profess

to suffer without the least reference to his atonement, and to be made happy for ever without any application to God, thro' him, for mercy—without any scriptural *faith* in his sacrifice or experience of its efficacy. If this be the true state of the case, we must expunge from our Bibles passages like the following ;—" Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life : *no man cometh unto the Father*, but *by me*." John xiv. 6. " Neither is there salvation in any other : for there is *none other* name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Act iv. 12. " He that *believeth not* the Son shall *not see life ;* but the *wrath of God abideth* on him." John iii. 36. " He that *believeth not* shall be *damned*." Mark xvi. 16.

Many of the Modern Universalists are rank *Socinians*; who believe that Christ was only a man of like passions with themselves; equally peccable with other men; and as a natural consequence, unqualified to atone for sin. Why, then, should they *believe* on *Christ*? Why not, with equal propriety, be required to believe on *Moses*? Or on *Gabriel*? In rejecting salvation thro' *Christ* they act consistently with their *socinian belief*, but at the same time, in opposition to the Scriptures and at the hazard of their eternal happiness.—Either therefore, the doctrine of a full punishment of sins in the present life must be given up, or the doctrine of salvation by grace thro' a mediator; for, they are utterly irreconcileable.

The Universalist dogma now animadverted upon *is false* as it *destroys the probationary character of the present life.*

What does a state of probation imply? A state, in which men are forming characters for another world—a state, to which they are on trial, acting in reference to a period when their conduct will be judged, and awarded according to its character—a state, evidently implying, that between the present actions of men and their future desti-

ny there exists an indissoluble union. But the doctrine, that men receive in this world all their punishment, and at death will enter into immediate felicity, subverts the very idea of the probationary character of the present life. According to this belief, men are not now on trial—are not acting in reference to a period when their conduct will be scrutinized, and awarded agreeably to its character—nor is there any connexion between their present actions and their future destiny. On our system salvation into heaven, as well as salvation on earth, is *conditional;* but, on the opposite scheme, salvation is unconditional. Men *must* suffer *here;* and men *must* be happy *hereafter.* There is no *possibility* of the soul's being "*lost*", or banished "*from the presence of God.*" All are as *certain* of being at death immediately received into the kingdom of heaven, as it is certain they must die:—and this without the least regard to previous character or behaviour. The *impenitent*, the *unbeliever*, the filthy, the *unclean*, the *abominable*, the *mid-night assassin*, the *bloody* or *self-murderer*, and the *vilest of mankind*, are, on this system, as *sure* of heaven as persons of an *opposite* and *most pious character.* Need we say that these opinions are hostile to the word of God? For proof, read the following passages; to which others, in the same strain, might be added in abundance. Unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and another one; to every man according to his several ability—"Occupy till I come"—"After a long time the Lord of those servants cometh and *reckoneth* with them." Mat. xxv. 14--30. Luke xix. 13. "But and if that evil servant shall begin to smite his fellow servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; the Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and" (what? take him immediately to heaven? make him immediately and forever happy? No—but) "shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with hy-

hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." Matt. xxiv. 48—51. "Let both grow together until the harvest—the harvest is the end of the world—so shall it be in the end of the world—The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Matt. xiii. 30—42. "So then every one of us shall give *account* of himself to God." Rom. xiv. 12. "The time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in *lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings* and *abominable idolatries;* wherein *they think it strange* that *ye* run not *with them* to the same excess of riot, speaking *evil* of you: who shall *give account* to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead." 1 Peter iv. 3—5. "Know ye not that the *unrighteous* shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither *fornicators*, nor *idolaters*, nor *adulterers*, nor *effeminate*, &c. nor *thieves*, nor *covetous*, nor *drunkards*, nor *revilers*, nor *extortioners*, shall *inherit the kingdom* of God." 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man *soweth*, that shall he also *reap*. For he that *soweth* to his *flesh*, shall of the flesh reap *corruption;* but he that *soweth* to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap *life everlasting*." Gal. vi. 7, 8. "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that *have done good*, unto the *resurrection* of *life;* and they that *have done evil*, unto the *resurrection* of *damnation*." John v. 28, 29. If the Modern Universalists can show that these passages comport with their belief, there is the same reason to believe that they can demonstrate the *devil* to be a *very pious spirit!*

The doctrine, that *men receive all their punishment in this life*, is *false*, because *it subverts the Scriptural doctrines of a future judgment and future punishment.*

It subverts the doctrine of a *future judgment.* If all men suffer here the full penalty of the law, and are invariably and unconditionally admitted to an immediate participation of bliss, what need is there of a future judgment? Or on what grounds can a future judgment be justified? All have been punished to the full amount of their desert; there is no broken law to vindicate; and all are rewarded—for *what*, on this system, it is difficult to say.—Hence an attempt has been formally made to set aside the Judgment Day altogether, and to refer all that is said of Christ's second coming to judge the world in righteousness, to some especial manifestation of his power or glory in the present world.—It is acknowledged that the "coming of Christ" is sometimes spoken of in the most lofty figures, with reference to some illustrious display of his power in the present world, especially in the destruction of Jerusalem; but to give the phrase this application *in every instance* is absurd in the extreme. For instance let us consider the latter part of the 25th Chapter of St. Matthew:—a portion of scripture most violently wrested from its proper meaning by the licentious torturing of Modern Universalist-Criticism. "Modern Universalists refer all that is said in the 25th chapter of Matthew, respecting the final judgment, to the destruction of Jerusalem. But any one who knows the history of their treatment of this Chapter, can have no doubt that their present interpretation of it is only a shift to avoid the awful truths it flashes upon a guilty conscience. First, they would have it, that by the *goats* we are to understand the *devils;* next, the *sins* of mankind; last of all, neither; but the *Jews*—yes, the *poor Jews* are the *goats*, who, eighteen hundred years ago, were sent into *everlasting fire*, and have ever since been suffering there with the *devil* and his *angels*, who, by the way, according to Universalists are mere *personifications*, *nonentities*, *nothing*. Well, all this is about as wise, as

when they tell us that the *Rich Man* stands for the *Aaronic High Priest*, and the *pious beggar* for the *Gentiles*; or that *Judas' hanging himself*, means only that he *died* by *excess of pious grief*; and his going to *his own place*, signifies only that he went to *one of the twelve thrones* on which the Apostles were to sit to judge the twelve tribes of Israel." ! ! ! Truly, this *original* interpretation of these passages is worthy of the other profound discoveries of the *nineteenth century*; and we are not sure, but that, for its better preservation, it ought to be carefully folded in gold leaf, placed in a casket of mother of pearl, and sent to the land of curiosities and deposited in the British Museum! Seriously, can rational beings, with the entire Scriptures in their hands, really and sincerely believe *this most ridiculous nonsense,—stuff*, which would disgrace the intellect of almost the greatest simpleton that ever existed? The man, who can give credence to these more than *Jewish Tales*, and "*prophane and old wives' fables*," must have proclaimed a divorce between himself and his understanding, or is under the influence of that "strong delusion," which "because he will not believe the *truth*," leads him to "believe a *lie*."

We utterly deny that there is, in the whole of the 25th Chapter of Matthew, and especially in the last sixteen verses, the *slightest reference imaginable* to the destruction of the Jewish City and polity. In the latter event there is nothing to correspond with the description of the event which the Saviour predicts. "The Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him." But, when Jerusalem was destroyed, did our Lord *come in his glory*, and were *all the holy angels with him*? "Then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations." Did the "*great white throne*" appear in the heavens? And was Jesus seated upon it? Were *all nations* gathered before him? *All* of every kingdom and kindred and tongue?

Were *Adam—Eve—all* of the *antedeluvians* there? Were *Noah*, his *sons*, and all of their *posterity* who lived within a *hundred years* of the destruction of Jerusalem there? Were all the *Romans* there who lived under the reign of the last thirty Emperors? Were all the *Mahommedans*, the *Goths* and *Vandals*—the *Saxons*—the Ancient *Britons*—the *Modern Europeans*, *Asiatics*, *Africans* and *Americans*, there? Were *we* of the *present day* there? We can answer for ourselves, that we have no recollection of being at the siege and destruction of Jerusalem. If the present race of Universalists recollect of being personally present on this occasion, they have no reason to complain of *short memories*; and they will pardon us if we suggest that they might favour the world with an *authentic* history of the seige and its consequences, related by numerous *eye-witnesses!*—Again:—were all the *posterity* of the *present* generations of men, to the end of the world, at this scene of calamities and woes? All these, at least, form a part of "*all nations*;" and if "all nations shall be gathered before the Son of man" and if the scene, described in the Chapter under review, refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, then all that we have mentioned must have been present:—but absurdity is enstamped upon the unwarranted construction of Modern Universalism.

"And he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left." Was any such *separation* made at the *time* and *place* to which the Universalists refer these verses? Pray, on which hand were they placed? Did they rank with the *sheep* or the *goats*? "Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:—For I was an hungered, &c. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, depart from me, ye

cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels :—For I was an hungered, &c." Now was there any thing in the destruction of Jerusalem to correspond with this part of the scene ? Was there any such *judicial scrutiny* entered into, or *judicial sentence* passed at the event just mentioned ? What was the "*kingdom*" which the "righteous" were to "inherit ?" The kingdom of *grace ?* This they possessed before. The kingdom of *glory ?* But mark, to enter upon this, they must be *butchered* by the Roman soldiery : We thought, however, that the righteous were to be "*recompensed*," not *destroyed*, "in the earth." What was the "*everlasting fire*," into which the "wicked" were to "*depart ?* The *death of the body* according to Modern Universalism. If so, then the *devil* and his *angels* must have had *bodies ;* for this "everlasting fire" was originally "prepared" for them ; and, as this punishment has been visited upon them, our opponents are consistent when they say the *devil is dead !* and that both *he and his angels are nonentities!* But if the *death of the body* be all that is meant by "the everlasting fire," why is this part of a sentence passed exclusively against the *wicked ?* Is not death the portion of the righteous also ? must they not die before they can inherit the kingdom of glory ? Would it not be equally proper to say to the righteous, "depart from me into everlasting fire ?" Again, if the death of the body be all that is intended by this denunciation, and if immediate happiness await the wicked hereafter, why does the Judge say to the wicked, *depart from me* ye *cursed?* Death does not cause them to be *separated* from Christ under his malediction, but brings them into his immediate presence to rejoice in his smile ? When both the righteous and wicked must pass through death, and equal felicity awaits both in the future world, we certainly find it difficult, on the Modern Universalist principle, to account for the marked antithetical phrase-

ology employed by our Lord—"COME *unto me* YE BLESSED—DEPART *from me* YE CURSED!"—"And these (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." Here the same remarks will apply; and the bearing of these awfully solemn words upon the destruction of Jerusalem, we candidly acknowledge, our penetration is not sufficiently acute to perceive. Nor let it be forgotten, that this sentence, either of acquittal or condemnation, will be passed upon "*all nations*:"—And if the scene described be made to refer only to the destruction of Jerusalem, then "*all* nations" *prior* and *posterior* to this event, have received their sentence, and thus the *judgment truly is past;*—the wicked portion of "all nations" have gone into everlasting punishment, in whatever this consists, and the righteous portion of "all nations" have gone into eternal life, in whatever this consists, and this nearly eighteen hundred years ago! So much for the *folly, absurdity* and *falsity*, of MODERN UNIVERSALISM. The 25th Chapter of Matthew *is* and *ever will be* an irrefragable proof of the utter incongruence of the Universalist-system with the Scripture doctrine of a FUTURE and FINAL JUDGMENT. "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set and the books were opened." Dan. vii. 9. 10. "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened—and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according

to their works." Rev. xx. 11. 12. "The Lord Jesus Christ—shall judge the *quick* and *dead* at his appearing and his kingdom." 2 Tim. 4. 1. Observe—Jerusalem was taken and destroyed by Titus A. D. 70. St. John wrote the Apocalypse A. D. 96;—so that in the verse quoted from that book, he cannot possibly refer to the destruction of Jerusalem; and yet his description of the day of Judgment is in perfect harmony with that of Daniel's and Our Lord's.

The doctrine, under condemnation, subverts also the Scripture doctrine of *future punishment.* The Judgment will decide upon the *characters* of men in order to decide upon their future and everlasting *state.* This, at least, is the view the Scriptures give of this solemn subject. "We must all appear before the Judgment seat of Christ: that every one *may receive* the things done in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." But if men receive *all* their punishment in this life, there can be no punishment hereafter. But we have already shown from the Scriptures that there is a future punishment; and thus the Universalist system is brought into direct collision with the oracles of God, and must therefore be essentially erroneous. For further proof that the wicked are to be punished hereafter and eternally, we refer our readers to the sixth Chapter *passim,* and to the subsequent pages of this work.

The doctrine that men receive all their punishment in this life, is *false* as *it destroys the powerful motive to personal godliness drawn from a fear of the future consequences of transmission,* thereby *giving the most effectual countenance to the practice of sin,* and is *therefore necessarily destructive to the souls of those who submit to its deception.*

The necessity of personal godliness in this life in order to personal declaration in a future state of being, cannot well be denied by those who believe in the authenti-

city of Divine Revelation. " Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin : but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God, " For the wages of sin is death," Rom. vi. 12. 13, 23. " If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." Ib. viii. 13. The practice of sin and the practice of godliness are in direct opposition to each other ; and any doctrine which sanctions the practice of vice, is opposed to the purity of the Gospel-precepts and to the entire system of Christianity.

Now, in religious matters, men are greatly influenced by their *fears*. A dread even of a future *limited* punishment is calculated, in some measure, to restrain men from present vicious indulgences; but how much more powerful to restrain from the commission of sin and urge to the attainment of a principle of genuine piety and practice of godliness, is the motive derived from the certainty of a future punishment *eternal* in its duration. Even *civil laws* are said to derive their *force* from this doctrine. " Montesquieu, author of the ' Spirit of Laws,' says that the idea of a place of future *rewards*, necessarily imports that of a place or state of future *punishments;* and that where the people *hope* for the one, without *fearing* the other, *civil laws have no force.*" To the principle of *fear*, as a motive to serve God, the Scriptures evidently appeal. " Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul : but rather *fear him* which is able to *destroy* both *soul* and *body* in hell." Unless it were necessary this principle would not be appealed to by the Sacred Writers. But on the Universalist scheme there is no ground for *fear ;* all idea of future suffering is annihilated ; the whole penalty of the law is now sus-

tained; men may live as they think proper, and die in their sins, yet certain happiness is immediately and eternally theirs; God cannot and will not make them miserable. Who does not perceive that such a doctrine opens upon men the flood gates of vice, dispenses with the necessity of personal godliness, and grants them an indulgence to sin as ample as their desires. All the powerful motives to an obedient life, derived from the certainty of a future state of punishment, are, at one blow, destroyed; and men are left to indulge their sinful propensities with the only check, that they will suffer here, perhaps, some temporary afflictions of body, or, at most, some remorse of conscience;—motives these, which are rendered nugatory by the consideration known to the guilty, that affliction of body may be greatly relieved, if not removed, and uneasiness of conscience assuaged by numerous palliatives. A person, therefore, who really believes this doctrine, and discredits that of a future punishable state, is prepared to commit any crime, however heinous, to the perpetration of which he may be tempted, by the wickedness of his own heart or by the instigation of the Devil, for all restraint, as regards future consequences, is gone; and if there be honorable or virtuous individuals, in the train of Universalism, they are virtuous and honorable, on other principles than those of Universalism.

But it may be asked, will not "gratitude and love —the pleasure of doing right and the remorse of doing wrong," be sufficient motives to "engage obedience and prevent transgression"?—The affirmative of this question we are aware is strongly asserted by the Universalists. But "try the experiment in regard to *human* government. Let it be proclaimed throughout the community, and among all classes of *rogues* and *villains*, that there are no courts of justice, no prisons, no places or instruments of justice; what, suppose you, would be the effect? would the pleasure of doing right engage

obedience to the laws, or secure that peace and good order of society? Would the inconveniences of remorse prevent swindling and theft, robbery and murders, and convert all the outcasts of society into honest and good men? Why then talk of gratitude and love, of the present pleasures of virtue, and sufferings of vice, as sufficient to secure obedience under the *divine* government?—If a system of human legislation, without rewards and punishments would be altogether inefficacious and nugatory, why would not the same be true of the divine government?"

In appealing to the motives of *love* and *gratitude*, the Universalists seem to forget that men are *naturally depraved, prone to that which is evil, delighting in forbidden and criminal pleasures.* "God is not in all their thoughts;" that is, to love and reverence Him; or if they think of Him, it is only to ask, "What is the Almighty that we should serve Him? and what profit should we have, if we pray unto Him?" and to say, "depart from us; for we *desire* not the knowledge of thy ways." Job. xxi. 14. 15. Were men *holy*, the motives of *love* and *gratitude* would be applicable; but it does not appear that these alone are sufficient. We find the Inspired Writers urging the "people of God" themselves to a discharge of duty by an appeal to their *fears.* "Be not highminded but *fear.*" Rom. xi. 20. "Let us *fear* lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." Heb. iv. 1. "Pass the time of your sojourneying here in *fear.*" I Pet. i. 17. It is true the principle here inculcated is not *slavish* or *tormenting;* but it is "godly *fear,*" a holy jealousy, which certainly implies a *deep concern* to please God, that they may be accounted worthy to escape the second death, and secure a portion in the heavenly inheritance.

But, taking men as they are naturally, we might, in nine instances out of ten, as well whistle to the wind to change its direction, and sing to the moon to increase her

light, as to expect to "turn them from the power of Satan unto God" by an appeal to their love and gratitude alone. They are not accessible by these motives; their *fears* must be operated upon; their *danger* pointed out; the *wrath* of God, as well as his love exhibited; and by their exposure to "*everlasting destruction*", as well as by the *love of Christ*, they must be urged to "flee from the wrath to come."—From the *effects* produced, we have reason to believe that such was the course observed by the Apostles. Hence under their preaching the people were "*pricked to the heart*"—a "Felix *trembled*"—from apprehensions of his danger the Jailer *fell prostrate at the Apostles' feet*—and the common enquiry then was, "*what must we do to be saved?*" Effects these, which, to us convincingly show, that the *supposed* Gospel of the Universalists, is not the same as the *real* Gospel of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. Was it ever known that *such results followed the preaching of any Modern Universalist divine?* Under such preaching, as assures persons, that they may walk in the sight of their own eyes, and follow the imaginations of their own hearts—that there is no future punishment, no hell of torment,—that they receive all their punishment here, and have nothing hereafter to dread, but the gate of death will be the gate of heaven,—were sinners ever *pricked to the heart*, did they ever *tremble under a sense of their sins and danger*, and exclaim *what must we do to be saved?*—Impossible! Yes, the very idea of such a state of mind is scouted at by Modern Universalists; and, indeed, there is no reason for it on their system. They preach, then, "another Gospel," than that delivered by our Lord and his Apostles. The latter preached the doctrines of a *future judgment*—a *future hell*—a *state of endless torments*,—and used them to *alarm the consciences*, *excite the fears*, and *influence the conduct*, of men. But the Modern Universalists *decry* a future judgment —a future hell, a state of endless torment, and assert in

opposition to the scriptures, that all the punishment due to sin is suffered in this world;—and hereby break down every barrier for the preservation of virtue, and licence men to "continue in sin". "Universalists may deny, if they please, the licentious tendency of their doctrine; but so long as conscience and common sense have any influence over the opinions of men, they will continue to believe, as they always have done, that sentiments like the above take off every restraint from vice, and strike at the dearest interests of religion and human happiness."

And is not the end of this heresy *eternal ruin*? Such, according to the Word of God, must be the inevitable consequence to all who embrace, and live and die under the influence of, such a doctrine. "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man; but the end thereof are the ways of death." Prov. xiv. 12. "When they shall say, peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them; and they shall not escape." 1 Thess, v. 3. "The wicked shall be turned into hell." The wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment"—Their the worm dieth not, the fire is not quenched." "They which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Gal. v. 21. "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and tell you even weeping, that they are the *enemies* of the cross of Christ: whose *end* is *destruction*, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things." Phil. iii. 18. 9. On the supposition, therefore, of the Truth of the Bible, Universalism will in the end prove a false foundation to all who build upon it—their "refuge of lies," when it is too late to remedy the evil, will be swept away—in all the overwhelming responsibility of their personal moral agency they will stand before God—weighed in the balances they will be found wanting, and their portion will be appointed "with hypocrites and unbelievers." *This is the natural tendency of Modern Universalism.* We acknowledge, that many,

who believe in the probationary character of the present life, and in a state of future rewards and punishments, loose their souls; but the fault is not to be charged upon the doctrine. They resist its influence—procrastinate an attention to their personal salvation— and, tho' aware of the consequences, continue to "live unto themselves" until overtaken by death. But the case is different on the other system. Believing there is no place or state of future misery, but that they receive all their punishment in this life, its adherents are *necessarily prevented from making scriptural preparation for the future world.* At death they are found with all their sins uncancelled, which they had, in vain supposed were expiated as they moved thro' life; and trusting for acceptance to this most fallacious of all fallacious beliefs, they drop into eternity, where their characters remain unchanged and unchangeable, and their eternal destiny is appointed by the righteous God, "who will render to every man according to his deeds—indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil." To cherish hope for the final salvation of persons, who die under these circumstances, is to extend the bounds of charity beyond the warrant of the scriptures. "Ye shall die in your sins and where I am ye never shall come."

Chapter IV.

Salvation not absolute, but conditional—the will of God, as it respects the salvation of men may be defeated,—inferences.

The Universalists, in supposing, that the "Will" of God concerning the salvation of *moral agents* will *infallibly* take place, greatly err. Thus they argue,—God "is not *willing* that *any* should perish"; therefore *none* will perish; and, as God "*will* have *all men* to be saved," so, *all men* will be *infallibly* and *finally* saved. This is one of their grand arguments.

Now we grant, that, The Divine Being assuredly wills, desires, the present and eternal salvation of *all men*, without limitation or exception: the following scriptures are in point, "God so loved the *world*, that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to *condemn* the world, but that the *world* thro' him *might* be *saved*." John iii. 16. 17. "God our Saviour—will have *all* men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for *all* to be testified in due time." 1 Tim: ii. 3-6.—"But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the

grace of God should taste death for *every* man." Heb. ii. 9. "The Lord—is long suffering to us-ward, *not willing* that *any* should perish, but that *all* should come to repentance." Pet. iii. 9. If, therefore, there be any *sincerity* in God—if any reliance to be placed upon His TRUTH —if His WORD be not a mass of contradictions and falsehoods—if in fact, the passages quoted have any meaning whatever—they must mean what they plainly declare—salvation, in its scriptural acceptation, is provided for, and sincerely offered to, *all* men without exception :—God is "the saviour of *all* men," as he has rendered the salvation of "all men" *possible.*

But we object to the inference drawn from the premises by the Universalists, because—

1.—God wills men to be saved, as He has constituted them, *moral agents*, and not as *pieces of passive mechanism;*—not *absolutely*, but *conditionally;* which conditions, He himself, by communicated grace, enables them to perform. These conditions are

Repentance;—"*Repent*, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin." Ezk. xviii. 30.

"God now commandeth *all* men *everywhere* to *repent.*" Acts xvii. 30.

Faith,— - - -"He that *believeth* on the Son hath everlasting life ; and he that *believeth not* the Son shall not see life ; but the wrath of God abideth on him." John iii. 36.

"He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved ; but he that *believeth not* shall be damned." Mark xvi. 16.

Regeneration,—"Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be *born* of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.—Marvel not that I said unto

thee, ye *must* be *born again.*" John iii 5. 7.

" For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new *creature.*" 2 Cor. v. 17.

Holiness,— - -" Follow peace with all men, and *holiness*, without which *no man* shall see the Lord." Heb. xii. 14.

" And there shall in no wise enter into it (heaven) any thing that *defileth*, &c. Rev. xxi. 27.

Obedience— - -" For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world." Titus ii. 11, 12,

" The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that *obey not* the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. i. 7—9.

Self-Denial;—" Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man will come after me, let him *deny* himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his (natural) life, shall loose it (his soul): and whosoever will loose his (natural) life for my sake shall find it (his everlasting happiness). For what is a man profited, if he gain the whole

world and loose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Matt. xvi. 24—26.

God, therefore, *wills all men to be saved;* but in accordance with *these conditions.* The conclusion, then, is irresistible, that without *repentance, faith, regeneration, holiness, obedience* and *self denial,* they cannot be *actually* saved. To substantiate, on scriptural authority, the doctrine of *universal actual* salvation, the *actuality* of *universal* repentance, faith, regeneration, holiness, obedience, and self denial must be first established. But *facts* are sufficiently in opposition to such a state of things; and the man, who asserts the contrary, must have arrived at the inglorious distinction of the *ne plus ultra* of moral imperceptibility. Many, notwithstanding the will of God to the contrary, live and die *impenitently* and *destitute* of all the other requisite qualifications above enumerated; and *living* and *dying* thus, they are according to God's word, *irretrievably* and *eternally* "lost." "Wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that *leadeth to destruction,* and *many* there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which *leadeth unto life,* and *few* there be that find it." Matt. vii. 13. 14.

To the conclusion of the Universalists, we reply

2. *By opposing their own wills* to *the gracious intentions of the Deity,* men *may deprive themselves of the salvation,* which it is *the good pleasure of God they should enjoy;* and, therefore, conclude, that the *will* of God, relative to human salvation, *conditionally* expressed, *does not necessarily imply actual accomplishment.*

Two or three scriptural proofs of the truth of this proposition possess greater weight than ten thousand plausible or fallacious arguments urged to the contrary.

"Open thy mouth wide and I will fill it. But my people (the Jews) *would not* hearken to my voice; and Israel *would none* of me." Ps. lxxxi. 10. 11.

"Because *I* have *called* and *ye refused*; I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded; but *ye* have *set* at nought all my counsel and *would none* of my reproof; I also will mock at your calamity, &c. Prov. i. 24—30.

"Yea *they* have *chosen their own ways*—I also will choose their delusions—because when *I called, none* did *answer*; when *I spake* they did *not hear*; but they did evil before mine eyes, and *chose* that in which *I delighted* not." Is. lxvi. 3. 4.

"But *they refused* to hearken and pulled away the shoulder, and *stopped their ears* that they *should not hear*. Yea, they *made their hearts* as an adamantine stone *lest* they *should hear* the law and the words which the Lord of Hosts hath sent in his spirit by the former prophets: *therefore* came a great wrath from the Lord of Hosts. Therefore it is come to pass, that as *he cried* and *they would not hear*; so they cried and I would not hear, saith the Lord of Hosts." Zech. vii. 11—13.

"The *kingdom of heaven* is like unto a certain king, which made a marriage for his Son, and sent forth his servants to call *them* that *were bidden* to the wedding: and *they would not come*" &c. Matt. xxii. 2—7.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem—how often *would I* have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and *ye would not.*" Ib. xxiii. 37.

"And *they* all with one consent began to *make excuse.* I say unto you that *none* of those men which *were bidden* shall taste of my supper." Luke xiv. 18—24.

"But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, we *will not* have this man to reign over us. Those mine enemies which *would not* that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me." Ib. xix. 14—27.

"It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye (the Jews) *put it from you*, and *judge yourselves* unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." Acts xiii. 46.

"They *receive not* the love of the truth, that they *might* be saved. And *for this cause* God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who *believed not* the truth, but *had pleasure* in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. 2. 10—12.

To remark on these passages at large is not, at present, deemed necessary; sufficient for our purpose is it to observe, that they bear the most unequivocal testimony to the fact stated above,—that men, as moral agents, may oppose and frustrate the gracious will of God, respecting their personal salvation:—if they convey not this truth, they are utterly destitute of any other assignable consistent meaning.

Nor should this be a cause of surprise;—it is a matter of daily and very general experience. We have already shown that "God *will* have *all men* to be saved"; but his *will* is that they should be saved *now*. The salvation of the Gospel is a *present* salvation; a state of religious enjoyment and practice to be possessed and evinced in the *present life*. "By grace *are* ye saved through faith." Eph. ii. 8. "Behold, *now* is the accepted time; behold, *now* is the day of salvation." 2 Cor. vi. 2. It is, therefore, as much the will of God that *all* men should be saved *from sin* and *made holy* and *obedient* in *this life*, as it is, they should be saved *from hell* and *glorified* in heaven *hereafter*. But does his "will" as it regards the salvation of *all men* in *this life* imply *actual accomplishment*? Are all men *now* actually saved? Saved from the carnal mind? from unholy affections, ungodly tempers, and impure desires? from the "love of the world—the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life?" from evil speaking and wicked actions? Are all men "justified, sanctified," and in possession of "peace and joy in the Holy Ghost?" Can any man, looking upon human society as it is, conscientiously affirm this to be the case? that "all men," without exception, are "saved"—that, all men, in every nation, kindred, and

tongue, are so taught by "the grace of God that bringeth salvation" and which "hath appeared to all men" "that denying ungodliness, and worldly lusts," they "live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ?" Titus ii. 11. 12. Were any person possessed of sufficient effrontery to assert the affirmative,—the unholy, depraved, and vicious *lives* of thousands, even of the christian world, so called, might, in a moment, without the aid of magical incantations, be brought forward, to confront him, and redden his cheek, if capable of the blush of shame. The "will of God," then, as it regards the *present actual salvation* of all men *may be*, and in numerous instances, *is*, beyond all doubt, frustrated. Where then is the impropriety, the inconsistency of extending this possibility, this certainty to the *future* world, and saying, that the "will of God" respecting the *eternal* salvation of "all men" *may be*, and beyond all doubt, *is*, in numerous instances of wilful obstinacy, and continued rejection of proffered mercy, defeated? The one case is as reasonable as the other. The stand we take then is this;—if the *will of God* concerning the salvation of *moral agents*, *necessarily* imply *actual accomplishment*; (a contradiction in terms)—then, as God "wills" *all men* to be saved "*now*," as well as *hereafter*, it follows that *all men are now* actually saved, in the scriptural sense of the term salvation—an inference contradicted in the most palpable manner by the experience of mankind in all ages of the world. The premises therefore must be wrong, and the will of God respecting the salvation of moral agents does not necessarily ensure their absolute, actual salvation; but may be defeated by their own perverse wills and sinful conduct. As, therefore, his will as to their *present* salvation may be frustrated, so may it be as to their *eternal* salvation; for his *will* as to their *eternal* salvation regards them in no other character than that of

moral agents. To admit the *former* and deny the *latter*, is the climax of irrationality.

"A great deal of confusion has arisen upon this subject from not considering in what cases the will of God may be opposed with success, and in what cases it cannot. The will of God, so far as it is made known to us is irresistible in every thing, except where the co-operation of the human will is necessary to bring about his purposes. God cannot make man virtuous and happy without the concurrence of his will, and no violence must be done to it, for there can be no *moral virtue* without *moral liberty*. Man may therefore, by continued resistance defeat the will of God concerning his salvation. The word of God is very express on this subject. Matt. xxiii. 37. "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! &c." (quoted before page 48.) Here the will of man and the will of God are represented as opposed to each other, and the will of man prevailing."(1)

From the foregoing discussion, we are justified in drawing the following inferences :—

1. *God wills all men to be saved.*

2. *He wills their salvation*, not *absolutely*, but *conditionally*.

3. *The conditions*, as previously stated, are *Repentance, Faith*, &c.

4. *Tho' God has*, thro' Christ Jesus, *opened up "a new and living way,"* by which "all men" *may* return to him and obtain salvation,—yet, MANY "*will not*" return, but persist in sin, "*neglect the great salvation*"—"*resist the Holy Ghost,*" and eventually "*perish.*" Or in other words, *God declares his willingness* to *save them* consistently with His own gracious arrangements, but *they will not be saved*—they "*will not come*" to Him, thro' His "Son" "*that they might have life*"—they *will not repent, believe*, &c.—they "*judge themselves unworthy of*

(1) *D. Isaac.*

everlasting life" and provoke the Holy One of Israel to "*swear in his wrath that they shall not enter into his rest.*"

5. *They*, who *will not* comply with the *Gospel-conditions* but *contemptuously* and *determinedly* refuse God's mercy, *must* "*die in their sins.*"

6. *That* men *may* "die in their sins," *leave this* world *in* a *state of guilt* and *condemnation*, is *evident* from *Scripture*, John viii. 21. 24, and the *experience of thousands.*

7. *They*, who "die *in* their sins," *are not saved in this world;* and the "*will of God*," respecting their *present, spiritual salvation*, is *not accomplished.*

8. *The* "*will of God*," relative to their salvation, *if* accomplished *at all*, *must* be accomplished *in the future, invisible world* :—the burden of proving which, by *scriptural declarations* and *legitimate arguments therefrom*, lies with the Universalists.

9. If *this cannot be done*—if the *will of God*, respecting *future, eternal* salvation, as well as *present, actual* salvation, *may be defeated;* if, indeed, the *promise of heaven* is given *only* to *them*, who, *in this life*, by performing the annexed conditions, *are personally saved;*—the *undeniable conclusion*, is, that *tho' God sincerely* "*wills* all men to be saved," *they* who are *not here saved*—who *live* and *die* in a state of *impenitence* and *unbelief, will not, cannot*, at *any future period*, however distant, or *whatever sufferings* they may endure, *be* SAVED *from* the torments of Hell *into* the glories and felicities of Heaven—they "*shall not*" at any, the most remote period in the future world; "*see*," enjoy "*life*," the fruition of heaven, "*but the wrath of God*" throughout eternity, "*abideth on them.*" John iii. 36.

Chapter V.

Preliminaries which the Restorationists must first establish before they can derive advantage from criticism on disputed terms — Absurdities involved in their belief.

In endeavouring to establish their doctrines, the Restorationists lay great stress upon the Greek words *aiōn*, *aiōnios*, &c; and because these words are *sometimes* used in an *accommodated sense* to point out a *limited period*, they very illogically conclude, that these terms, when applied to future punishment, *never* imply *strict eternity*, but are employed, and are invariably to be understood, in their limited meaning. But all the passages, in which these terms are used, might be surrendered, and yet the doctrine of the eternity of future punishment shown to be perfectly scriptural:—its truth depends not upon the controverted meaning of *one* or *two* words, but is interwoven with the very texture of the Scriptures, and placed before us in numerous and various forms of expression and illustration, which, in the estimation of all candid persons, exclude the very possibility of controversy. These passages shall be adduced in their proper place.

In the meantime, let it be observed, that, in our argumentation with the Restorationists, no advantage can be taken of any mere *verbal criticism* of the disputed terms,

in which we believe the eternal duration of future punishment is stated, until they establish certain preliminary doctrines.

One of these preliminary doctrines is, that the future state of punishment is *disciplinary*, or *probationary*. The reason why the future state of punishment must be proved to be disciplinary before any advantage can be taken of verbal criticism, allowing, for the sake of argument, that this could be done, is evident. Suppose that *aiōnios* is capable of a limited meaning, yet, before it can be assumed that on the cessation of punishment, *reward* or *salvation* must *necessarily* follow, it must be previously established that the state of punishment is one which admits of a *moral change* in the sufferers, and *will be certainly succeeded by reward*. For, on the supposition of a limited punishment, it may be, unless there be satisfactory assurances to the contrary, that the soul is either entirely *annihilated*, or reduced to a state of *torpor* or *unconsciousness*. Hence arises the necessity of proving the proposition, that the future state of suffering is *probationary*; for unless this be done, the *final restoration* of condemned sinners *to heaven* does not *follow* as a *necessary consequence* of *limited punishment*, were the truth of it granted.

The appeal, in this instance, must be to SCRIPTURE only; for *Reason, exclusive of the word of God*, can find no *data*, no principles, on which to exercise its powers, as the future world is spiritual and invisible and not subject to the inspection of mortals; and as the mind of God on the subject cannot be known *without a revelation*. "For who hath known the mind of the Lord?" Rom. xi. 34.

If Scripture be adduced, the passages quoted, must state the doctrine contended for either *expressly* or in words which admit of it by *fair implication*. But if Scripture be *silent*, as to the future state of misery being

disciplinary, we can obtain information from no other quarter; and its silence will afford a strong presumption against the Universalist-supposition:—in fact, it will have the force of a positive denial or contradiction; for, it cannot, for a moment, be imagined, that, in a Book professedly revealing the will of God to man on all articles of faith, and especially respecting the plan of salvation, and man's future and everlasting destiny, silence would be maintained on a subject so important in itself—so influential on human hopes and human conduct—and on which information is so much required. Indeed, if Hell cannot be proved to be a state of discipline, it must be *punitive*; for the Scriptures represent it as a state of *punishment*; Matt. xxv. 46. and it is acknowledged by that part of the Universalists themselves, called Restorationists, that punishment is inflicted; and on such a ground, its punitive character excludes all possibility of a moral change in the sufferers and of subsequent reward.

In the same manner—from the Word of God, the advocates of future restoration, must prove, *in what* this discipline consists; what are the *means*, if any, to be employed in restoring the souls of the "damned"—whether the *immediate punishment itself*, or *some other means*, *extraneous* to the punishment, and used whilst the suffering is actually endured:—in fact, that Christ is offered to the "damned" as a sacrifice for sin, available to their pardon and sanctification—for it is the solemn declaration of Christ himself, "I am the way, the truth and the life: *no man cometh unto the Father* but *by me*"—John xiv. 6. a declaration equally true of both worlds—no man, in any period of this life, or in any period of the future state, can come to, approach the Father, be united to Him, and obtain his favour and love, but by Christ,—"For there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved;" Acts iv. 12. and

that, among other things, provision is made for the operation, the awakening and regenerating influence, of the Holy Ghost in the future state of punishment,—for except a man be *born* of water and of the *Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*"—John iii. 5. a truth this, as applicable to the *future* as to the *present* world.

These points must be stated plainly and unequivocally; and the portions of the Word of God, on which they are founded, or by which they are attempted to be proved, must be likewise clearly exhibited,—so that we may have an opportunity of judging whether or not the doctrines in question be either expressly or impliedly contained in the Holy Scriptures; the reasoning, if any, be correct; and the inferences drawn from the premises be legitimate. For it must be evident to every reflecting mind, that, if the propositions, above mentioned, be not thus substantiated by the *express* or *fairly implied*, unsophisticated Word of God, UNIVERSALISM must totter to its base and sink in ruins.

Nor must it be forgotten, that the Restorationists are required furthermore to prove, in the manner previously specified, that the *means employed*, if any, *for the purposes of discipline*, are *so* employed, *with a certain design* of rescuing the souls of the "damned" *from* their place of torment and elevating them *to* the enjoyment of ineffable happiness in heaven; and that *in every instance* the means used will be *unfailingly efficacious* in accomplishing their design. Without these points, also, are satisfactorily established and confirmed by the unerring decisions of the revealed will of God as contained in the Bible, Universalism cannot stand—its "*cloven foot*" discovers itself, and "THE MARK OF THE BEAST" appears on its fore-front in glaring characters with this inscription—"MY FEET GO DOWN TO DEATH: MY STEPS TAKE HOLD ON HELL."

There are, then, four things for the Restorationists to prove, in order to substantiate their doctrine:—1. *That*

Hell is a state of discipline or probation. 2. *That means are there used for the purification of condemned and wicked spirits.* 3. *That the design of these means is to prepare the souls of the damned for heaven.* 4. *That, in every instance, the means will be effectual for this purpose.*

Without wishing to prejudge the argument arising from these particulars, we must say, that if these constitute the doctrine of the Scriptures, it does to us appear *very unaccountable*, that nothing should have been heard of them from any of the Ancient Divines until the time of ORIGEN, who flourished in the *third century*, and is said to have been the *first* ancient writer who maintained the opinion of the "restitution of all things;"(2) that they made no progress until the German Baptists arose, some of whom, before the reformation, propagated them, as did also the Tunkers, their descendants, in America; (3) that these things have been "hidden" from the "wise and prudent," the humble and the pious in all ages of the Christian church;—that the Bible has been a *sealed book* to those, who by profound erudition, philological acumen, laborious research, patient investigation, humility of heart, unbiassed judgment, candour of mind, religious enjoyments and love of truth, were most eminently qualified to ascertain the meaning of the sacred records on these momentous subjects;—that the light of TRUTH has been so long, so deeply, so universally obscured by clouds of *error*, that, in ages *remote* from the present age, it scarcely shone, as a solitary star amid the surrounding gloom,—and, in *later* periods has but dimly illuminated the darkened horizon of the religious world; and, that, at the present day, with all their sincerity—their amiability—their high-toned piety—their noble and philanthropic Institutions—their zeal and knowledge and usefulness—their aimings at the Divine Glory and amelioration of the saddening, miserable

(2) *Vide* PANTALOGIA, *sub voce* ORIGEN.
(3) *See* EVAN'S *Sketch.*

condition of suffering humanity—with their Souths, their Pearsons, their Barrows, their Henrys, their Watts, their Doddridges, their Wesleys, their Whitfields, their Adam Clarkes, their Richard Watsons, their Robert Halls, and other numerous Divines, who shine as stars of the first magnitude in the bright and glorious galaxy of Theology —THE RELIGIOUS PUBLIC are *generally abandoned to the greatest errors* on subjects, of all others, the most important in themselves, and the most intimately associated with their everlasting well-being! To us, we are free to confess, the absurdities involved in the belief of such a state of things, as above supposed, are so palpable, so monstrous, so incredible, that we cannot but reject, with consummate aversion, the *system* by which they are generated; and earnestly request the TEACHERS and advocates of Universalism, seriously and impartially to read the following passage, taken from the Second Chapter of the Second Epistle of Peter—"But there were *false teachers* among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in *damnable heresies*, even *denying the Lord that bought them*, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose *judgment now of a long time lingereth not*, and *their damnation slumbereth not*. For if God *spared not* the *Angels* that *sinned*, but cast them down to *hell*, and delivered them into *chains of darkness* to be *reserved unto judgment*;—The Lord knoweth how to *reserve* the *unjust* unto *the day of judgment* to be *punished*."

Chapter VI.

SCRIPTURES CANNOT CONTAIN CONTRADICTORY DOCTRINES—THE FUTURE STATE OF PUNISHMENT, SHOWN FROM THE SCRIPTURES, NOT TO BE A STATE OF DISCIPLINE OR TRIAL—UNIVERSALISM, THE OFFSPRING OF THE DEVIL, AND TO BE REJECTED.

THE foregoing Chapter, among other things, required the Universalists to prove four points, essential to the maintenance of their doctrine :—on which points, we now intend to bring the Scriptures to bear, and, from them show how utterly unsupportable are the propositions in question.

Before entering upon the discussion of the subjects before us, let it be premised, that as our appeal in this controversy is to the Scriptures—for we have no argument with the person who denies the authenticity and inspired character of the Scriptures—the SCRIPTURES *themselves cannot contain* CONTRADICTORY DOCTRINES. "What is, is; and it is impossible for the same thing *to be* and *not to be*" at the same time, is an axiom not more true than that the Word of God cannot contain doctrines, which are *plainly, positively* and *diametrically opposed to each other*. If the contrary of this be maintained, where, we ask, is the rule of right—the standard of truth—the balance in which to weigh our opinions—or the *authority* to

which we may subject our faith and practice ? In fact, if the contrary of the above be maintained, we must yield up our Bibles into the hands of deriding Deists, or scoffing Infidels, as a book, full of inconsistencies, and unworthy the credit of any reasonable man. But other views, than these, have we of the Sacred Volume :—it is divinely inspired—perfect Truth without mixture of Error—and consistent and harmonious in all its parts. "*All Scripture* is given *by inspiration of God*, and is *profitable* for *doctrine* for *reproof*, for *connection*, for *instruction in righteousness* : That the *man of God* may be *perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.*" 2 Tim. iii. 16. 17.

Now the doctrines of future *limited* punishment and future *eternal* punishment, are in *direct opposition to each other; both* cannot be *true*, nor can the *Bible* contain them *both* ; and one or the other must of necessity be *false* and *anti-scriptural.* Hence, if, on examination, we find the doctrine, of a strictly *ceaseless* punishment inculcated in the Bible, then it follows as a natural consequence, that the doctrine of a *limited* punishment is both *false* and *anti-scriptural.*

With these observations, we now address ourselves to the examination of the four points previously stated.

First Point. *Is the future state of punishment a state of Discipline or Trial ?*

To this question we unhesitatingly append the most unequivocal *negative.* Our reason for so replying is briefly this—

The Scriptures are not only *silent as to this being the case* but *contain passages* at *utter variance* with *the doctrine of a future state of trial* :—the *contrary doctrine*, therefore, *must be true.*

The following propositions are self-evident and require no proof ;—The *present, christian* dispensation *cannot* be the *last merciful dispensation, if another, in which*

mercy can be obtained, will succeed it:—Again. The *future* state *cannot* be a state *in which mercy can be obtained*, IF the *Scriptures decide* that *the present Christian* dispensation *is* the *last in which mercy can be obtained* : IF the *future state* be one, *in which mercy* CANNOT *be obtained, then it* CANNOT *be, to condemned spirits, a state* of *discipline* or *probation* :—*Our answer to the question at issue will be justified,* IF *we can show from the Scriptures that* the *present, Christian dispensation* is the LAST *in which mercy can be obtained* :—Finally—IF *this* be our *only state of probation,* and, IF *mercy can alone be obtained in this life,* then, *is the doctrine of the Universalists in fearful hostility to* THE TRUTH OF GOD.

Without fear of contradiction from any student of the Bible, we assert that the Scriptures *uniformly* represent the *present, christian* dispensation, as the *last dispensation in which mercy can be obtained.*

This is evident from the following parable of our Lord. —"There was a certain Householder which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a wine-press in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country: and when the time of the fruit drew nigh, he sent his *servants* to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits thereof. And the husbandmen took his servants and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. Again he sent *other* servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise. But *last of all* he sent unto them his SON, saying they will reverence my Son. But when the husbandmen saw the Son, they said among themselves, this is the HEIR; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance, and they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard and slew him." Matt. xxi. 33—39. That by the "SON" here mentioned, our Lord meant HIMSELF is evident from his application—"Did ye never read in the Scriptures, the *stone* which the *builders rejected*, the

same is become the *head of the corner?* Therefore say I unto you, the *kingdom of God* shall be *taken from you,* and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof,"—42. 43. v. Truth, though delivered in a parabolic form, is truth still. In the above parable, a plain matter of fact is stated and history confirms the account. God did send the Jews numerous servants in succession, and *last of all* "his only begotten Son," but him "they took and by wicked hands crucified and slew;" and the "kingdom of God has been taken from them" and given to another "nation". The design of the parable is evidently to show that the "gift" of his "SON", is the last interference which the Deity will make to "save the world;" and that, if men reject him, "there" hereafter "*remaineth no more sacrifice for sins; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries.*" Heb. x. 26, 27.

The same momentous truth is inculcated in the parable of the *unmerciful servant,* recorded in Matthew's Gospel, xviii. 23—34. From the account it appears that this servant was greatly indebted to his Lord, and had not wherewith to pay; that, at his earnest request, his Lord forgave him all he owed; but on his subsequent cruel treatment of a fellow servant, his discharge was cancelled, his obligations were renewed, and he himself was delivered to the tormentors, not to obtain deliverance until the entire debt was paid. The inferences to be drawn from this statement are the following:—1. He was forgiven *under this dispensation* and under it *forfeited* his pardon. 2. He was delivered to the tormentors; a circumstance which takes place at death. 3. He was so delivered, not to be rescued, not to be forgiven, "till he should pay all that was due unto" his Lord. 4. But this he could never do; for it is expressly said, v. 25, "he had not to pay." 5. Therefore if he never could pay, or what is the same, if he *never could be forgiven,* he *never could be liberated,*

but must *forever* lie under the displeasure of his Lord; v. 34—a circumstance, which certainly proves *this* to be the *only* dispensation, *in which forgiveness can be obtained*, and that *the future state is not one of trial.* Nor must it be supposed that this parable was not one of universal concernment to men generally. To prove the contrary, that the truths contained in the parable were intended to have a practical bearing on the conduct and experience of men generally, our Lord adds, in the way of solemn application,—*so* likewise shall my heavenly Father *do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.*" There is no foundation here for the figment of future restoration.

St. Paul, teaching the same doctrine as his Divine Master, commences the Epistle to the Hebrews with the sublime declaration: God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners spake in times past unto the Fathers by the prophets, hath in these *last days* spoken unto us by His Son" &c. The phrase "*last days*" certainly implies that no other merciful dispensation will follow this; (4) and from the consideration of this all important truth, as well as from the Dignity of Christ, the Apostle concludes: "*Therefore* we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast and every transgression of disobedience received a just recompence of reward; *How* shall *we escape if we neglect* so great salvation?" ii. 1—3. A question tantamount to the strongest affirmation, that we cannot hereafter possibly escape, either by skill or force, the aggravated punishment merited by aggravated guilt—guilt contracted against infinite love and infinite obligations.

The apostle proceeds:--He that despised Moses' law

(4) "*Last days*]. The Gospel dispensation, called the *last days*, and the *last time* because *not* to be *followed* by *any other dispensation.*" *Dr. A. Clarke* in loc.

died without mercy, under two or three witnesses: of *how much sorer punishment* suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him that hath said, VENGEANCE belongeth unto me, I will recompense saith the Lord.—It is a *fearful thing to fall into the hands* of the Living God." Heb. x. 28—31. Not surely if Universalism be true, and there be another state of probation! To *fall into the hands of God*, is to fall *under his displeasure;* and He, who *lives forever* can *punish forever*. How dreadful to have the displeasure of an *eternal Almighty* Being to rest upon the soul forever! Apostates, and all the persecutors and enemies of God's cause and people, may expect the heaviest judgments of an incensed Deity; and these not for a *time* but through *eternity*" (5). The expression of the Apostle is among the strongest that can be used to import the strictly punitive character of the state of future punishment in opposition to its being a gracious dispensation. First. The despisers of the law of Moses died "*without mercy*"—then the contemners of Christ are to have a *still sorer punishment*—lastly, the most awful aspect is given to this punishment in the terror-inspiring annunciation—"It is a *fearful thing* to *fall into the hands of the living God*"! Reader! may you never realize the import of these truly "fearful" words in your own experience!

From a firm conviction of the truth we are advocating, that the present is the *last* dispensation in which mercy can be obtained, the Apostle exclaims, "behold, Now is the *accepted time*, behold, Now is the *day of salvation;*" 2 Cor. vi, 2. A passage, which, whilst it offers mercy freely now, and guards against presumption, presents the dark side of the cloud to the camp of the Universalists,

(5) *Dr. A. Clarke.*

and frowns upon their doctrine, as to the future invisible state being a state of moral discipline, an "accepted time" to seek the Lord, and a "day of salvation."

We arrive at the same truth, that this is the *last* dispensation for the acquirement of salvation, from the fact of *this life* being represented as the *only time* allotted for *preparing for the future*. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the *grave*" (the place of departed spirits) "whither thou goest." Eccl. ix. 10. With no show of propriety can the former part of this verse be confined exclusively to temporalities; for whilst the Scriptures inculcate "diligence in business," they require us, as a matter of greater importance to be fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." Not until, therefore, it can be proved that the *service of* God and *a preparation for eternity*, form no part of the employment which our "hands should find to do," or which the Deity has assigned us to perform, can we allow these momentous subjects to be excluded from the passage; and these being included in the range of the requisitions of the "Preacher" the latter part of the verse is sufficient to decide the question, under discussion, against the Universalists. The whole force of the exhortation to *present activity* in "*working out the salvation of our souls*," and *preparing for an eternal state of existence*, is founded upon the solemn fact that there is "no work" of *salvation*, "nor device," no *contrivance*, no *means* for *acquiring salvation*, "nor knowledge", "nor wisdom", no *theoretic* or *practical religion* to be obtained, "in the grave," in the receptacle of *the dead*, the *world of spirits*, "whither thou goest" "into which all men certainly enter." If the conduct of men can at all be rescued from the charge of absolute folly, it seems to be founded on the presumption that at death, the term of their probation does not expire, and that some means shall be employed in an intermediate state, for the

removal of guilt and the attainment of purity. The folly of such an expectation it is quite unnecessary to prove in an address to those who profess the Protestant faith, or who have studied the sacred volume with minds unfettered by impartialities, and open to conviction. It is an expectation which the whole spirit and tendency of revelation declares to be delusive and ruinous, which the *text contradicts* in the most unequivocal, the most solemn, the most decisive language, when it asserts, 'there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave.'" (6)

Our Lord himself inculcates the same truth, when without giving the least hint of the possibility of "working out the salvation of the soul" in the intermediate state he says "I *must work* the works of him that sent me, *while* it is *day* : the *night cometh* when *no man can work*." John ix 4. The terms "day" and "night" here used are metaphorical; the *former* is very frequently used to point out the *brevity of human life*, the latter, *its close*, or *death;* so by our Lord. "I must accomplish the work for which I came into the world while it is day; while the *term of this life* of mine shall last." (7)—"All the work he had to do in his own person here on earth was to be done *before* his *death*; the *time of his living in this world* is the *day* spoken of.—When the *night* comes we cannot work, because the light afforded us to work is extinguished, the grave is a land of darkness, and our work cannot be done in the dark. And besides our *time allotted* us *for our work* will *then be expired*; when our master tied us to duty, he tied us to *time* too; when *night* comes *call the labourers*, we must then show our work, and receive according to the things done. In the world of retribution we are no longer probationers." (8) This passage, with the one preceding it, affords proof "strong as demonstra-

(6) *Dr. G. Burns' Sermons, f.* 247. (7) *A. Clarke, in loc.*
(8) *Matthew Henry* v. d. m. in loc.

tion" against the opinion of the Universalists on the point at issue and in favour of our view of the case. *After* death *no man can work*:—no impenitent unrenewed person can perform the least duty of a religious nature, when "the *night* has come:" The future state of punishment therefore, is not disciplinary, but immutable and eternal.

The point we advocate is proved, likewise, from the circumstance of the *reward* or *punishment* of individuals commencing IMMEDIATELY *after* death,—which is inconsistent with the idea of a future state of probation. "Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. xxii 12.

The most satisfactory and elucidative comment on these words of Our Lord, is furnished by Himself in the case of LAZARUS and DIVES. (9) Luke xvi. 19–31. Lazarus died and was *immediately* carried by angels into "Abraham's bosom," another phrase for "paradise," or a *place of happiness.* The Rich Man, also, died and was buried; but in *Hell* he *immediately* lift up his eyes. The term "hell" *hadē* cannot here mean *only* the *place of separate spirits;* as, it is immediately added, declarative of its painful and punitive character, "being in torment," and, as it is, also, a place widely differing and far distant from that where Lazarus then was;—he "seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom:" and his application to Abraham was principally to obtain relief, if possible, to his agony.

To this it may be replied, the *punishment* is the *discipline itself*, and is, therefore, very justly inflicted upon the subjects of it *immediately* after death. To this point we

(9) "This account of the *rich man* and *Lazarus*, is either a *parable* or a *real history.* If it be a parable it is what may be:—if it be a history, it is that which *has been.* Either a man may live, as is here described, and go to perdition when he dies: or, some have lived in this way, and are now suffering the torments of an eternal fire. The account is equally instructive, in whichsoever of these lights it is viewed." *Dr. A. Clarke in loc.*

design hereafter to draw the attention of our readers; (1) but in the mean time observe, the idea now broached is one of the most dangerous notions that ever found a lodgment in the brain of a rational accountable being, and is contradicted by the whole tenor of the Sacred Scriptures both in their direct and influential communications, and especially by that portion of them last under consideration.

We proceed with the account:—From it, DIVES, it appears, whilst "*in hell*" became *sensible of his misery*, and with cries *supplicated the exercise of mercy*;—but HEAR IT —HE WAS REFUSED! Yes! HE WAS REFUSED! "And he *cried* and said Father Abraham, *have mercy on me*, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou, in thy life time, receivedst *thy good things*, and likewise Lazarus *evil things*; but *now he* is comforted and THOU art *tormented*." 24, 25. v. This was truly appalling; but appalling as it was, it would be endurable were there any prospect, however *distant*, of his being delivered from his torments, restored to the divine favour, and blest with subsequent and eternal happiness. Says the Universalist, this will assuredly be the case. God is merciful; hell is disciplinary; and when the soul has sufficiently atoned for its sins by suffering, or is purified by some other means, it shall be delivered from its misery, restored to the approval of God and admitted to heaven. These opinions are asserted with as much confidence as if they peered forth from every verse of Sacred Writ. But what said Abraham on this subject? What was his reply? Now let it be especially remarked, that were the doctrine of future restoration true, or did it form a part of the creed of the "Father of the faithful," he had a most favourable opportunity of stating his belief and comforting the torment-

(1) See next Chapter.

ed mind of Dives with considerations analogous to the following; 'Tis true you justly suffer for your sins, and although alleviation is with-held for the present, yet take this not as an ill omen—despair not but "encourage yourself in the Lord thy God"—You are not "*lost*," or abandoned of God—He has designs of mercy toward you—"for a small moment," compared to eternity, has he forsaken thee; but with great mercies will he gather thee"—after "you have suffered awhile," you shall be brougbt out of those "doleful regions," blest with divine favour, receive, with Lazarus, whom you formerly despised, an unfading crown of glory, and "so shall you be for ever with the Lord"—for the Lord will not be wrath for ever. But, we ask, was this the language of Abraham—the friend of God? Did he, on this occasion, preach Universalism? Did he hold out any such prospects:—Let him answer for himself: "And *besides all this, between* US and YOU there is *a great gulf fixed;* so that *they* which *would* pass FROM HENCE *to you* CANNOT; *neither* CAN *they* pass *to us*, that *would* come *from hence.*" 26. v. We may here remark, 1. This case contains the opinions of our Lord upon the subject of future punishment. 2, It shows that the *benevolence* of God, on which the Universalists lay so much force to confirm their views, *has no operation* in HELL—*not even a drop of water*, the smallest alleviation, is allowed to, *cool the tongue*, to *mitigate the most excruciating pain.* 3. The *certainty* of *eternal* punishment is here expressed, in the most forcible, affecting and solemn manner, *without the use* of *aionios*, or any other disputed term, 4. If a person wished of set purpose to point out the strict eternity of future torment, stronger expressions or figures, for this purpose, could not be employed than are here employed by our Lord. 5. Our LORD does, in the case before us, most unquestionably teach the *strict eternity* of future punishment,—otherwise words to point out this doctrine cannot possibly be found. 6. The whole case is utterly

incompatible with the doctrine of a future state of probation, and most convincingly proves our proposition, that *this* is the *last* dispensation *in which mercy* or *salvation can be obtained.*

Again:—The same truth is arrived at from the fact, that, at the JUDGMENT DAY, men will be *judged* and *awarded* for the *deeds done in the body;* a circumstance, in the highest degree inconsistent with the idea of the *intermediate state* being one of moral discipline or trial.—"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ that every one may receive the things *done* in *his* body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. v. 10.

Aware of the formidable array, which this verse presents to their system, the Modern Universalists have employed all their force to weaken its impression. The words, "done," and "his," marked in italics, are not in the original, but are supplied by the translators;—hence they would read the passage thus,—that "every one may receive in his body," thereby endeavouring to confine the award of punishment to *this life* only. But the mere mention of this criticism carries with it its own refutation. For supposing we read the passage, *receive in his body;* yet, it must be remembered, that *we are all* to STAND *before* THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF GOD *for this purpose;* and as we believe in the punishment of the "body" as well as the "soul," after the resurrection, we do not see what advantage they can derive from their rendering, if they bear in mind the fact just stated.

But there is reason to believe that the translators, by the words they have supplied, have given the true idea of the passage. One general rule of construction—a rule familiar to every classical Scholar—is, "By a most elegant elipsis, any finite verb may be understood, and inferred by reflection from another verb of the like import, actually expressed within the period."—Examples, demonstrating

not only the propriety but the necessity of this rule, might be multiplied from the Classic Authors, but a few will suffice.

1. Impius haec tam culta novalia miles *habebit*?
Barbarus has segetes?—VIRG. *Ecl.* 1. 71. 72.

"*Habebit*," expressed in the first line, must be *supplied* in the second. Thus the translation—"Shall a ruffian soldier *possess* these so well cultivated lands? Shall a barbarian *possess* these fields of corn,"—

2. Quem mortis timuit gradum,
Qui siccis oculis monstra natantia;
Qui *vidit* mare turbidum, et
Infames scopulos Acroceraunia?
HOR. *Carm. Lib.* I. 3. 17—20.

Translated thus;—"What form of death could terrify him, who *beheld* unmoved the rolling monsters of the deep; who *beheld* unmoved the tempestous swelling of the sea, and the Acroceraunians—infamous rocks!"—"*Vidit*" expressed in the *latter*, must be supplied in the *former* part of the sentence.

In the following example the word to be supplied must be in a different tense from the word expressed:—

3. Hos tibi *dant* calamos, en accipe, Musae,
Ascræo quos ante seni. VIRG, *Ecl.* vi. 69, 70.

Thus translated;—"The Muses *give* to you these pipes, (here, take them) which before (supply *dederant*) they *had given* to the Ascrean sage," viz. *Hesiod.* The adverb *ante* (before) shows that the verb supplied must be in the *past tense*.

The word *supplied*, in the verse in question, is *actually expressed*, in the latter portion of the verse; and, we repeat it, the Venerable Translators, in their mode of rendering, have violated no rule of construction, but have been governed by a rule of universally acknowledged

propriety—"that every one may receive the things, (supply) *done* in his body, according to that he (verb actually expressed) *hath done;* &c. which is, doubtless, a proper rendering, and most certainly in perfect harmony with the general scope of the Scriptures. WHITBY paraphrases the passage thus;—"For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may (*then*) receive the things done in his body; (or by the body;) according" &c. WESLEY renders it—"that every one may receive according to what he hath done in the body, whether good or evil." With this, the translation of CHARLES THOMPSON, Esq. substantially agrees;—"that every one may receive according to what he hath done in this bodily state, whether good or evil." We have been more particular in vindicating the authorized translation than the cavil of the Universalists, in itself, really deserves:—Our only apology is, that as their *exception* forms one of their strong holds, it was necessary to wrest it from them by showing its utter destitution of all foundation.

The force of the argument from 2 Cor. v. 10, may be thus exhibited;—All must appear at the judgment seat of Christ in the same character as they possessed when their spirits left their bodies—appearing in the same character as they possessed when they left the body, there has been, in the case of the wicked, during the immediate state, no change of character for the better—if no change of character for the better, then, this affords a strong reason for believing that the intermediate state, with them, admits not of a gracious change of character—the wicked appear at the judgment seat unforgiven and unrenewed—making their appearance at the judgment seat of Christ in an unforgiven and unrenewed condition, they appear with "the wrath of God abiding on them":—in fact, this view of the case destroys the very idea of a future intermediate state of probation—for if probationary, the things "done" *there* would be as liable and as proper to be brought into judgment as those "done in the body"—but

the passage in question cuts off every notion of the kind. In the day of "Judgment" each "one will receive according to that he hath done in his body, whether it be good or bad."—Quere;—What description of sentence will be passed at the "Judgment Day" in the case of one who *died in his sins* and in the *intermediate* state, *was forgiven*,—if he will be *judged* and *awarded according to the deeds done in the body*?

The description, given by our Lord himself, of the Judgment Day, and the alleged grounds of acquittal and condemnation, corroborate the above view of the case. Turn to the 25th of MATTHEW, and read from the 31st verse to the end of the chapter, and you will find that the righteous and the wicked *were judged* for deeds done, or which ought to have been done, in the body:—that the righteous the truly pious, whose "faith" wrought "by love," were justified by their works; "for I was an hungered, &c.—and the king shall answer,—inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me"—and that the wicked, those, whose faith was dead and who were not regenerated and sanctified but lived and died in their sins, were condemned for their works, or rather more properly, for their *not* doing—"Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, &c. For I was an hungered, &c. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them saying, Verily I say unto you, forasmuch as ye *did* it *not* to one of the least of these, ye *did it* not to me." Consistency must oblige the Universalists to say that the "righteous" were in the intermediate state, and that the "wicked" having it in their power, did not "feed" the righteous, nor "give them drink," nor "clothe" them, nor "visit them in prison," whilst they were in their disembodied state; for they contend that the wicked will *not* be judged for the deeds done or not done *in the body*—the

only alterative on this scheme, is, that they neglected their duty in the intermediate state,—for it must have been neglected in some place—and our Saviour decides the point that it is for the want of the performances before specified, that the wicked shall at last be condemned. But turning away from such absurdities, we remark, that the *acts* previously mentioned are properly the acts of *time*, and can be performed and neglected only *when* the righteous *are in the body:*—hence the wicked will receive their final sentence of condemnation for duties neglected, as well as for sins committed, whilst in the body. The force of this passage is irresistible.

Again: "Rejoice, O yonng man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes: but know thou for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." Eccl. xi. 9. Now are not all the acts here mentioned the *acts* of the "Young man" whilst in this world, "*in the body*"? And yet for "these things" so done by him whilst "in the body" he will be brought into judgment—a decision this as plain as words can make it.

"God—who will render to every man according to *his deeds;* For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law—in that day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my Gospel." Rom. ii. 6, 12, 16. The phrases "deeds"—"sinned without law"—"sinned in the law"—undoubtedly refer to the transactions of this life, which consequently must be done in the body:—and yet *for these* men are finally to be judged and awarded.

So forcibly have the Universalists felt the doctrines contained in the above passages to press against their system, that to escape their force, some of them, with equal audaciousness and criminality, have denied a *future general judgment altogether*—thereby affording another proof of the utter iniquitousness of the system—declaring,

that men are judged and awarded in this life, so as to have nothing to answer for hereafter!—(2)

This opinion, miserably wretched and erroneous as it is, is as much opposed to the future reward of the righteous, as they suppose it makes against the future punishment of the wicked. If men are judged and awarded in this life, then the righteous are judged and awarded in this life; and consequently, if by the judgment of God passed upon their conduct, they receive their reward here, they are excluded from all reward hereafter. But, to this, it may be replied,—tho' judged and awarded, they are rewarded in this life only partially,—the promise of "eternal life" is still given. But we answer, why may not the counterpart be true,—that, tho' judged and awarded, the wicked are in this life only partially punished, the threatening of "everlasting punishment" is still held out?—The assumption refutes itself.

Our principal objection to this unblushing error is that it is decidedly unscriptural. To prove our assertion we need not adduce the many passages, which the Sacred Volume contains upon the subject; one or two will suffice. Let it then be observed, that the "Day of Judgment" is a day solemnly appointed by the Deity. "He hath appointed a day, in the which he will *judge the world* in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given *assurance* unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Acts xvi. 31. Now couple with this the following declaration of the same Apostle—"it is appointed unto men *once to die*, but after this (after death) the judgment;" Heb. ix. 27. and there is the strongest assurance of a FUTURE GENERAL JUDGMENT, which words can possibly convey. How unsound, how radically wrong, how extremely dangerous the system, which can be maintained only by such a sweeping

(2) This subject the reader will remember is discussed in Chapters 2d and 3d; but is again introduced to strengthen our argument.

denial of one of the fundamental doctrines of the Sacred Word of God,—a doctrine, reiterated with the most solemn and affecting emphasis by Our LORD, and the sacred Penmen who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost! How alarming the situation of those who either really or pretendedly embrace such a system, and use their utmost endeavours to propagate their principles! "I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall *add* unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall *take away* from the words of the book of this prophecy, GOD *shall take away his part out of the book of life*, and out of the Holy City, and from the things which are written in this book." Rev. xxii. 18. 19,

Our belief, that the present dispensation is the *last, in which mercy is obtainable*, receives confirmation from the Scripture fact, that, *after the sentence is passed*, the *wicked* "*go into punishment*" declared to be "*eternal*," and not the slightest hint is given of their future deliverance, —a circumstance this, utterly unaccountable on the supposition of the Universalists.

Refer again to the latter part of the 25th chapter of St, Matthew, and it will be seen, that after the characters of the righteous and wicked are separated, and placed, the former on the right, the latter on the left hand of the Judge! the sentence is passed. To those on his "*right* hand" the king shall say, Come, ye *blessed* of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;" v. 34. "Then shall he say also unto them on the *left* hand, Depart from me, YE CURSED, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." v. 41. Now here are the judgment and the sentence. Does the Judge console the condemned by stating—You have another chance for your life—the state, into which you are now entering, is certainly very dreary and painful, but it

is probationary—and, if you are not wanting to yourselves, you may be released and yet enter into my kingdom of glory? Surely, were Universalism true, something like this would naturally escape the lips of the Judge. But is this the case? Did he give them any hope? So far from this being the case—so far from giving them any hope—he closes their awful history by these still more awful words—"And these," the persons last addressed, the *wicked*, "shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal": And here the curtain drops—not a word, as to their future restoration, breaks the silence—the last sounds which die upon the ear, are, "AND THESE SHALL GO AWAY INTO EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT: BUT THE RIGHTEOUS INTO LIFE ETERNAL"!

St. Paul teaches the same alarming truth: "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance and long suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds: To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality eternal life: But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man, that doeth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile. For there is no respect of persons with God." Rom. ii. 4-9, 11. Here also the punishment of the wicked is threatened; but not one word, that they shall ever be saved from it and rank with them, to whom is rendered "glory, honor, and peace."

Another quotation, on this point will suffice. "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the *dead*, small

and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the *sea* gave up the dead, which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast *into the lake of fire.* This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Rev. xx. 11-15. Here several things deserve attention. 1. The Apostle is here speaking of the General Judgment. 2. The persons who are to be judged are mentioned; "the dead, small and great"—persons of all ages and conditions—those not excepted who "are alive" at "the coming of the Lord," for they "shall be *changed,*" which change will be equivalent to death. 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52.—3. The different receptacles yielded up the dead they possessed: the sea gave up those who had been drowned—*death,* meaning the *grave,* delivered up the *bodies* of men—and *hell, hades,* the receptacle of separate spirits, good or evil, surrendered up their *souls.* Thus, "that they may be judged, punished or rewarded, according to their works, their bodies and souls must be reunited; *hades,* therefore, gives up the spirits; and the sea and earth give up the bodies." 4. "Death and hell were cast into the lake of fire." "Death himself is now abolished; and the *place* for separate spirits no longer needful. All dead bodies and separated souls being rejoined, and no more separation of bodies and souls by death to take place; consequently, the existence of these things is no farther necessary. 5. The lake of fire, or the punishment in the eternal world, is the *second death.* "The first death, is that from which there may be a resurrection; the second death, is that from which there can be no recovery. By the first, the body is destroyed during time; by the second, body and soul are destroyed through eternity." (3) Let it also be noted,

(3) *Vide Dr. A. Clarke's Notes.*

that, the "second death" is something from which the righteous are to be preserved—"be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee a *crown of life*—He that overcometh shall not be hurt by the second death." Rev. ii. 10, 11. Here "the crown of life" or the eternal reward, and "the second death," are set in opposition,—necessarily causing the latter to mean the opposite of "eternal life," i. e. an eternal punishment. Again; the "second death" is something to be inflicted upon the wicked exclusively. "But the fearful and unbelieving, &c. and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." Rev. xxi. 8. 7.—6. After the abolishing of death and *hades*, the place of separate spirits, for reasons already assigned, then, we are informed, that, "*whosoever* was not found written in the *book of life*," i. e. was not prepared for heaven, "was cast into the lake of fire," consigned to the "second death;" and there they are left without the slightest intimation of future recovery or restoration. When "they that are *ready* enter" in to the marriage supper of the Lamb, "the door is shut;" and to all subsequent applications by the unprepared, however importunate or loudly expressed, for admission to the felicities of heaven, the unvarying answer of the Lord, is, "verily I say unto you, I know you not;" "I APPROVE or regard you not and therefore disown you." (4) On the supposition of the Universalists, it is improbable—it is incredible—it is impossible—that the Scriptures would use such unqualified language, as above quoted, on man's final destiny, and not give us some explicit information on the subject of the ulterior designs of the Deity respecting his future deliverance from the place of suffering. A more erroneous—a more misguiding book than the SACRED SCRIPTURES, on the Universalist scheme, never was penned and given to the world; for, in regard to the eternal world, they in-

(4) *R. Watson's Exposit. in loc.*

variably use such terms as necessarily exclude the very supposition of a future state of probation, and final recovery of those that loose their souls."

Unite the three last particulars,—That 1. The reward or punishment of men commences *immediately* after death; 2. That, at the day of General Judgment men will appear in the *same* character as they possessed on leaving the world, and shall be *judged* and *rewarded* according to the "deeds *done in the body;*" 3. That after the sentence of condemnation is passed the "wicked" go into "everlasting punishment," without the least intimation of their *future* deliverance;—and what becomes, we ask, of the main pillar of Universalism, that the future state is one of moral trial? It resembles the "house which the foolish man built upon the sand."

The preceding remarks receive confirmation from the fact, that *heaven* and *hell*, future happiness and future misery, future reward, and future punishment, are, in the Sacred Oracles, set in opposition to each other,—the one necessarily excluding the other. "Say ye to the righteous that it shall be *well* with him:—Woe unto the wicked it shall be *ill* with him." Is. iii. 10, 11. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake some to *everlasting life;* and some to shame and *everlasting contempt.*" Dan. xii. 2. "For the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the *graves* shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; *they* that have *done good* unto the *resurrection of life;* and *they* that have *done evil*, unto the *resurrection of damnation.*" John v. 28, 29. "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking *vengeance* on them that know not God, and that *obey not* the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe in that day." 2,

Thess. i. 7—10. "And these (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment BUT the righteous into life eternal." Matt. xxv. 46.

The characters, and the respective rewards and punishments, are there contrasted, and no intimation is given that they shall ever merge into each other or be succeeded by one another. The reward of the "righteous," of those "who have done well" is declared to be "eternal:" but the same divine testimony decides in equally strong language, that the punishment of the wicked will be "everlasting" or *endless*:—the conclusion, therefore, is that, as the respective characters, and future retribution of each, are placed in direct contrast, and announced in equally cogent term of strict eternity, the misery of the wicked, of those that "have done evil," will be strictly interminable:—if so, it follows that this is the *last* dispensation in which salvation is attainable.

But, if, in direct opposition to the invariable decisions of scripture upon the subject, it be contended, that the future state of misery is disciplinary, and the punishment, from the very probationary character of the state, can come to an end,—what reason, we ask the Universalists, can be assigned against the truth of the exact counterpart of the subject, that the state of future happiness is also disciplinary, and that the reward of the pious, from the very probationary character of the state, can likewise come to an end—and as the wicked shall take their place in "heaven," so the righteous shall take their place in "hell," and that these changes, in endless succession, shall take place throughout eternity? What reason, on their principles, can they assign against this state of things? The one is as reasonable as the other; for the same identical words are used to point out the duration of the misery of the one, as are used to point out the duration of the happiness of the other. In the case we have put, what becomes of the express, the positive, the une-

quivocal assurrance of Holy Writ, respecting the eternal perpetuity of heavenly happiness? The future state cannot be probationary.

FINALLY—If the present be not the last dispensation of mercy, in which salvation can be obtained; the *commands warnings*, and *threatenings* exhibited in the Word of God, and employed to induce men *now* to "repent"—*now* to "believe on Christ"—*now* to "consecrate their service to God"—*now* to "strive to enter in at the strait gate,"—to cut off the right hand sin" and "pluck out the right eye sin,"—that they may be "saved,"—that "iniquity prove not their ruin,"—that they be not "cast into the fire whose flames are quenched not and where the worm never dies," that they avoid His "anger who has power to destroy both soul and body in hell," that they "come not into condemnation," have "their portion with hypocrites and unbelievers" and be "cast into outer darkness," where is weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth,"—*are all senseless jargon, without foundation, without meaning, merely intended to excite fear where no fear is, real deceptions, positive untruths.* Nor is this all—THE MINISTERS of the Sanctuary, who urge their flocks, by the above truly awful sanctions to "seek the Lord now while He is to be found and call upon Him while He is near"—to "flee from the wrath to come"—"escape the damnation of hell"—to "work out the salvation of their souls with fear and trembling,"—so that they may not "perish," "loose their souls," "become cast away," fall under the "power of the second death" and "be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of God and from the glory of his power,"—APPEAR WITH A LIE IN THEIR MOUTHS, tho' for these sanctions and expressions they plead, "Thus saith the Lord," and tho' by these lies, or by God's blessing upon the delivery of these lies, they "turn many to righteousness" and "save souls from death;" and, to complete the climax, OUR SAVIOUR *and* HIS APOSTLES take the "pre-eminence"

among the number of FALSE WITNESSES ! ! ! From such a system of Christianity,—a system productive of such results—"GOOD LORD DELIVER US!"

If Universalism, either Ancient or Modern, can confront, and wage war with the passages of Scripture, adduced in this Chapter,—and, if, in opposition to their plain, undeniable import, it can hold out the assurance of a state of future probation, or deny a state of future punishment in *toto*,—all we can say, is, Universalism is possessed of unparrelled effrontery, and displays the most daring and blasphemous presumption. It shows that it is the legitimate offspring of him, who "said unto the Woman, ye shall not surely die." The plain matter of fact is—

HIS IMPERIAL SATANNIC MAJESTY PREACHED UNIVERSALISM TO EVE! She believed it—was deceived—induced her husband to disobey—and thus

"Brought death into the world, and all our woe."

From the wide-spreading, age-continuing, and soul-destroying effects on MANKIND of the first embracement of Universalism, men should be extremely jealous of that soft, smooth phrase, "ye shall not surely die" eternally, from whatever quarter it may proceed, whether immediately from the Devil himself, or mediately from any of his human emissaries; and when presented for their reception, they should spurn it from them with utter abhorrence and holy indignation, saying, "*Get thee behind me* SATAN : *thou savourest not the things that be of God.*" To any, who are inclined to admit the shining, insidious serpent to their bosom, we would say, in the language of St Paul, Beware—"lest by any means, as the *serpent beguiled Eve* through his subtelty, so your mind should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." 2 Cor. xi. 3.

Having thus proved from the Scriptures, that the pre-

sent is the *last* dispensation, in which mercy can be obtained, it follows as a necessary consequence, that the *future* state, to condemned spirits, CANNOT be a state of *discipline* or *probation*.

Chapter VII.

MEANS ARE NOT USED IN THE FUTURE STATE FOR THE PURIFICATION OF DAMNED SPIRITS AND FOR THEIR RESTORATION TO THE FAVOUR AND IMAGE OF GOD—NOT THE PUNISHMENT ITSELF—PENAL SUFFERINGS NOT CORRECTIVE BUT THE CONTRARY.

SECOND POINT. *Are* MEANS *employed in the future state for the purification of damned spirits, and for their restoration to the favour and image of God? Answer* No.

The negative of this question, we feel ourselves in duty bound to advocate:—Our belief is, the Scriptures, when considered in their textual and contextual meaning, are perfectly silent as it respects *means* to be *hereafter* used for the purposes mentioned in the question, and contain passages at utter variance with the opposite belief.

The discipline, or means used, if any, must be either, 1. *The punishment itself.* 2. *The Word of God read or preached.* 3. *The sanctified efforts of the righteous.* 4. *The mediatorial and Intercessory offices of Christ.* Or 5. *The influence of the Holy Spirit leading to repentance and faith in Christ, and promotive of holiness and obedience.*

Except the first particular, the means specified, are the means, which we know are appointed by the "Head of the Church" to be used for the obtainment of salvation in this life; and as God is a being that *changes not*, and

as his *plan of salvation* is as *immutable* as himself, the only fair conclusion is,—if means are indeed employed hereafter for salvable purposes and unless he has informed us to the contrary—that the means in the *future world* will be the *same* as those in the *present*. But the Scriptures are silent as the grave as to *other* means;—therefore, if any be employed, they must be the same as those already specified, with the one exception. All present means, tho' there may be others, of a strictly instrumental nature, besides those to which we have just referred, such as providential circumstances, &c. do, in point of fact, resolve themselves into the four last general ones above mentioned; but to meet the Univeralists we have included the punishment itself:—if, in our examination of the Scriptures, we find these wanting, we may justly conclude that the absence of these implies the absence of all other means.

Quere;—*Can the disciplinary means* be *the punishment itself?* *Answer* No.

In replying negatively to this question we quote the observations of a distinguished Divine;—

"I presume it will be taken for granted that there was no *suffering* in the world previously to the introduction of *sin:* suffering is an imperfection in nature; and a creature, in a state of suffering, is imperfect, because a miserable creature. If an intelligent creature be found in a state of suffering, and of suffering evidently proceeding from the abuse of its powers; it necessarily supposes that such creature has offended God, and that its sufferings are the consequence of its offence, whether springing immediately from the crime itself, or whether by Divine Justice as a punishment for that crime. As sufferings in the animal being are the consequence of derangement or disease in the bodily organs, they argue a state of *mortality;* and experience shows that they are predisposing causes of death and dissolution. Derangement and disease, by

which the regular performance of natural functions is prevented, and the destruction of those functions ultimately effected, never could have existed in animal beings as they proceeded from the hand of an all-perfect and intelligent Creator. They are, therefore, something that has taken place since creation; and are demonstrably contrary to the *order*, *perfection*, and *harmony* of that creation; and consequently did not spring from God. As it would be unkind, if not unjust, to bring innumerable multitudes of innocent beings into a state of suffering or wretchedness; hence the sufferings that are in the world, must have arisen from the offences of the sufferers. Now if *sin* have produced *suffering*, is it possible that *suffering* can *destroy sin*? We may answer this question by asking another: Is it possible that the *stream* produced from a fountain can *destroy* the *fountain* from which it springs? Or, is it possible than any *effect* can destroy the *cause* of which it is an effect? Reason has already decided these questions in the *negative*. Therefore, suffering, which is the *effect* of sin, cannot possibly destroy the sin of which it is the effect. To suppose the contrary, is to suppose the grossest absurdity that can possibly disgrace the understanding of man.

"It is essential, in the nature of all effects, to depend on their causes; they have neither *being* nor *operation* but what they derive from those causes; and in respect to their causes, they are absolutely *passive*. The *cause* may exist without the *effect;* but the *effect* cannot subsist without the *cause:*—to act against its cause is impossible, because it has no independent being, nor operation; by it, therefore, the being or state of the cause can never be affected. Just so sufferings, whether *voluntary* or *involuntary*, cannot affect the *being* or nature of *sin*, from which they proceed. And, could we for a moment entertain the absurity, that they could *atone for*, *correct*, or *destroy the cause* that gave them being, then we must

conceive an effect, wholly dependant on its cause for its being, rise up against that cause, destroy it, and yet still continue to be an *effect* when its cause is no more ! The sun, at a particular angle, by shining against a pyramid, projects a shadow, according to that angle, and the height of the pyramid. The *shadow*, therefore, is the *effect* of the *interception* of the sun's *rays*, by the mass of the pyramid. Can any man suppose that this *shadow* would continue well defined, and discernible, tho' the pyramid were annihilated, and the sun extinct? No. For the *effect* would necessarily *perish* with the *cause*. So, sin and suffering; the latter springs from the former: sin cannot destroy suffering, which is its necessary effect; and suffering cannot destroy sin which is its producing cause: Therefore salvation by *suffering* is absurd, contradictory and impossible."

The above reasoning will apply with equal force to sufferings in the future state, as to those which are sustained in this world; and as much of the sufferings in the eternal world is the natural effect of disobedience in this life, so, the suffering so endured can never be the means of destroying sin and purifying the soul—unless we are disposed to maintain the absurdities which have been so powerfully proved necessarily to spring from the contrary belief.

Let us now consider the case of *penal* sufferings in the other world.

"*Penal sufferings*, in a future state," continues the Author above quoted, "are supposed by many, to be sufficiently efficacious to purge the soul from the moral stains contracted in this life; and to make an atonement for the offences committed in time. This system is liable to all the objections urged against the preceding, and to several others peculiar to itself: for, if there had not been sin, there had not been punishment. Penal sufferings, inflicted by Divine Justice, are the desert of the crimes which require justice to inflict such punishments. If the suffer-

ings, inflicted by this Divine Justice, be supposed to be capable of annihilating the *cause* for which they are inflicted; if they annihilate the cause, they must be *greater* than that cause, and consequently unjust; because in that case, the punishment would be *greater* than the *offence*. Such penal inflictions could not proceed from a righteous God.

"But the ground of this system is absurd: we have no evidence from Scripture or reason, that there are any *emendatory* punishments in the *eternal world*.

"The state of *probation* certainly extends only to the ultimate term of human life. We have no evidence, either from Scripture or reason, that it extends to another state. There is not only a deep *silence* on this, in the Divine records; but there are the most positive declarations against it. In *time* and life, the great business relative to eternity is to be transacted. On passing the limits of time, we enter into *eternity*: this is the *unchangeable* state. In that awful and indescribable infinitude of incomprehensible duration, we read of but *two places* or *states*—Heaven and Hell; glory and misery: endless suffering and endless enjoyment. In these two places, or states, we read of but *two* descriptions of human beings—the *saved* and the *lost;* between whom there is that immeasurable gulf, over which neither can pass. In the one state we read of no *sin*, no *imperfection*, no *curse:* there, "all tears are for ever wiped away from off all faces; and the righteous shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father." In the other, we read of nothing but "weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth;"—of "the worm that dieth not;" and of "the fire which is not quenched." There, the effects and conquences of sin appear in all their colourings, and in all their consequences. There, no dispensation of grace is published; no offers of mercy made; the unholy are unholy *still;* nor can the circumstances of their case afford any means, by which their

state can be meliorated; and we have already seen, that it is impossible that *sufferings*, whether penal or incidental, can destroy that *cause*, (sin,) by which they were produced.

"As to the *atonement* which is to be made to Divine justice, by enduring the torments of the damned, for ages numerable or innumerable, it is not found in the letter of the Divine oracles, nor by any fair critical deduction from that letter. Purgatory, professing to be an *intermediate place*, previously to its examination, has a sort of claim on our attention; but when this profession is examined, it is found to be as *unreal* a *mockery*, as the *limbus of vanity*, from which its ideal existence has sprung. But the doctrine of the *final extinction of the fire that is not quenched*, and the *final restoration of all lapsed intelligences*, has no such claims; *it appears before us as a formal contradiction of every scripture which relates to that awful subject;* founding itself on meanings which have been extracted from *Greek* and *Syriac* words, by critical torture; and which meanings, others, as wise as the appellants, have proved, that these words, in such connections, cannot bear."(5)

The error of the Universalists, as it regards the pretended efficacy of future punishment to purify the soul, lies in the supposition that it is *corrective* in its nature. That future punishment is corrective in its nature, designed for the good of the sufferer, is a mere gratuitous assumption, receiving no support from the Scriptures but contradicted by them. It is not denied, that God *corrects* men here for their good; especially his "people." "Ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, my son despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art *rebuked* of him: For whom the Lord *loveth* he chasteneth, and

(5) *Dr. A. Clarke, Sermons*, 3 vol. 254—259.

scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure? but he for our *profit* that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." Heb. ii. 5—11. From the terms employed the *corrective* nature of these present painful visitations cannot be misunderstood.

But, we ask, is this the language—"chastisement, correction, scourging"—which the Deity applies to future punishment? Does he style the inhabitants of "hell" by the endearing phrase, those "whom the Lord loveth?" Does he say he *chastises* them for their "profit," that they "might be partakers of his holiness;" and that tho' their sufferings for the present are not joyous but grievous, yet *afterward* they yield the peaceable fruit of righteousness to them being exercised thereby? Is this the language of God to the damned? Can a single passage in the entire range of revealed truth be found, on which, such or similar expressions are used respecting the torment, the punishment of those who are suffering the "damnation of Hell?" Yes! we ask for a single passage, where it is said, future sufferings are corrective in their nature and designed for the good of the sufferer. It cannot be found—with all their pretended parade of Scripture to support their doctrines, the Universalists cannot produce one solitary expression to the above

effect, and they know they CANNOT—There is everything to the contrary.

We may here, in contrast to the above, profitably notice the *titles* given to the wicked, and the terms used to designate their sufferings in the future world.

Among these *titles* we find the following: "*Ye are of your father the Devil*"—John viii. 44. "*rebellious children*" Is. xxx. 1. "*lying children*"—Ib. 9. v. "*children of transgression, seed of falsehood*"—Ib. lvii. 4. "*children of the wicked one*"—Matt. xiii. 38. "*children of disobedience*" Eph. ii. 2. "*children of wrath*" Ib. ii. 3. "*cursed children*"—2 Pet. ii. 14. "*children of the Devil*"—1 John iii. 10.

It is to be observed, that, altho' these titles naturally belong to those who subsequently become "the children of God," yet of those who remain in their natural condition, they are the permanent designations—characteristic of them in this world and in the world to come.

As it regards the terms employed to point out the future sufferings of the wicked, it is certain, the Scriptures speak of them, not as *corrective*, but as *punitive*, as the *demerit of crimes*, under the idea, also, of *ever-continuance*, and in such *terms*, which, as we have already shown, necessarily exclude all idea of their being a merciful visitation, and bar out all hope of the final restoration or salvation of the suffering party. "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking *vengeance*" (mark this--"taking *vengeance*") on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be *punished*" (not *corrected*) with everlasting (not *limited*) *destruction* (a strange term, surely, for *fatherly chastisements!*) *from the presence of the Lord* and *from the glory of his power;*" 2 Thess. i. 7—9. never to be restored to that "presence" or that "glory." "For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and *loose himself*, or *be cast away*." Luke

ix. 25. "And shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption." 2 Pet. ii. 12. "We are not of them that draw back unto *perdition;* but of them that believe unto the saving of the soul." Heb. x. 39. "But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and *perdition* of ungodly men." 2 Pet. iii. 7. "To whom the *mist of darkness* is *reserved* for ever." Ib. ii. 17. "Fear him which is able to *destroy* both *soul* and *body* in *hell.*" Matt. x. 28. "He shall have *judgment without mercy*, that hath showed no mercy." James ii. 13.

Now read these expressions again, "destruction, everlasting destruction, lost, castaway, perdition, utterly perish, judgment without mercy," &c. and we ask, with what propriety can they be applied to the future punishment of the wicked, if, that punishment be corrective and only designed for their good? In fact, if the views of the Universalists, on this subject, be correct, "the damned in hell are no more cast away, lost, destroyed,—they no more perish, or suffer perdition,—than any of God's elect (obedient believers) are "cast away" &c. while they are in this world. Hell is no more a place of destruction than this world. The wicked in hell are no more vessels of wrath filled (by themselves) to destruction, than the saints are in this world. The damned are under discipline; so are even the most virtuous and holy, while in this life; yet they (the virtuous) are not lost, cast away, rejected as reprobate silver, or destroyed by God; but are kept as the apple of his eye. And as the (supposed) means of grace, under which the damned are placed, are (thought by the Universalists to be) far more adapted certainly to secure and promote their greatest good, than any means which we enjoy in this state;—(for the Universalists imagine the future means are absolutely infalliable;) to consider and to speak of them (the damnned) as lost, castaway, destroyed, &c. because they are under

those means, is to the highest degree absurd. They are just as much further removed from a state, which can justly be called destruction, perdition, &c. than they were, while in this world, as the means of grace which they (are supposed to) enjoy in hell are, (according to the Universalist belief,) more powerful and effectual to prepare them for happiness, than those means which they enjoyed in this world.

"Suppose a man seized with some dangerous disease, and a variety of means is used for his recovery, but in vain. Suppose it appears, that if no more effectual means be employed, he never will be recovered. Suppose further, that at length, an entirely different course is taken with him, a course which is not only far more likely than the former to be successful; but concerning which there is absolute certainty, that it will be successful: I ask, can the man now under the operation of these most excellent and infallible means, with any truth be said to be lost, to be cast away, to be destroyed, &c? Or if those terms must be applied to one or the other of those situations, in which we have supposed him to be at different times; to *which* of them (the *former* or the *latter*) are they applied with the *least truth* and *reason*?" (6) The *latter* certainly.—Now apply this to Universalism. Its abettors affirm that the future means will be infallibly efficacious; then the terms lost, destroyed, cast away, will not apply to the latter case at all; but if they must apply to either, they will apply with more propriety to the present condition than to the future state of the disobedient. Yet we know them who have said of certain wicked characters, "the latter end is worse than the beginning," 2 Pet. ii. 20. "And the last state of that man is worse then the first." Luke xi. 26. We must, therefore, either give up Universalism, or its views of the corrective nature of future punishment, or expunge from our Bibles the phrases

(6) *President Edward's Treatise.*

soul lost, perished, destroyed, &c. for they are in direct contradiction one to the other. So evident is this, that the "Destructionists," who reject the doctrine of eternal misery, and in opposition to sacred testimony, plead for a literal destruction, or annihilation, taking the term in its popular sense, of the wicked, have been compelled to reject the notion of the corrective nature of future punishment, assigning the following, among other reasons for their rejection;—"the nature of future punishment, which the scripture terms death, determines the meaning of the words *everlasting*, *eternal*, and *for ever*, &c. as denoting *endless duration*, because no law ever *did* or *can* inflict the punishment of death for a limited period; that the punishment cannot be corrective, because no man was ever put to death either to convince his judgment or to reform his conduct."(7)

Again:—Punitive dispensations of Providence do not necessarily imply fatherly chastisements, as the Universalists contend they do. Punishments have been inflicted in this world that were not designed for the spiritual good of the parties concerned. Instance, the *destruction* of the old world by the *flood*. Was that a fatherly chastisement? Our Saviour declares they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, living in the greatest unconcern, "and knew not until the flood came and took them all away?" Matt. xxiv. 39. Now suppose that some cried unto the Lord and were saved, yet, it is certain, *all* were not saved; for "the spirits" of some of them were in "prison" two thousand years afterwards, (8) 1 Pet. iii. 19, and to them, surely "the *besom of destruction*," was not a *fatherly visitation*. The entire history of this awful transaction is point black against the contrary belief. "God saw the wickedness of man was great in the earth. It repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth and it grieved him at his heart.

(7) *Vide Evan's Sketch.* (8) See Chapter IX.

The Lord said I will *destroy* man from the face of the earth. Noah found *grace* in the eyes of the Lord. By faith Noah, being warned of God of things, not seen as yet, moved with *fear*, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he *condemned* the world." Gen. vi. 5—8. Heb. xi. 7. Instance, also, *the cities of the plain*. Their inhabitants were not visited in *mercy* :— "God turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha into ashes *condemned* them with an overthrow, making them an *ensample* unto those that after should live ungodly" 2 Pet. ii. 6. "Sodom and Gomorrha—are set forth for an *example*, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire" Judge 7 v. ; referring to the awful condition of their inhabitants in *eternity* as well as in *time*. Instance again the case of Ananias and Saphira. The former was thus charged, "Ananias, why hath *Satan filled thine heart* to *lie* to the Holy Ghost? thou has not lied unto men but unto God" on "hearing these words" he "fell down and gave up the ghost : and *great fear* came on all that heard these things." The moment the lie was out of Saphira's mouth, she was dead. Acts v. 1—11. The same was the case with "Lot's wife;" no sooner had she disobeyed, than her punishment overtook her, and, as a monument of Divine displeasure, she became a pillar of salt. Gen. xix 26. In this view was it regarded by Our Lord; for, as a warning, as an instance, not of *fatherly correction*, but of *exemplary punishment*, he exhibited her history to his own disciples, with the solemn admonition, "Remember Lot's wife." Luke xvii 32. Instance, once more, *the destruction of the inhabitants of Jerusalem*. Their punishment was not designed for their spiritual good. "For the *wrath* is come upon them to the uttermost." 1 Thess. ii. 16. "For these be the days of *vengeance*." Luke xxi. 22. "And when he was come near, he beheld the City, and wept over it, saying, if thou *hadst known*, even thou, at least in this *thy day*, the things which belong unto thy

peace! but *now* they are *hid from thine eyes.*" Luke xix. 41, 42. Now let any person, whose mind is unwarped by prejudice, read the above instances of providential visitation, and will not *truth* oblige him to acknowledge, that they are instances of inflicted punishment, but punishment inflicted upon the offenders in *wrath* and not in *mercy*—inflicted by a holy, indignant Deity; not as a *Father*, but as a *moral Governor*, not for the *benefit* of the transgressors, but as the just *deservings* of their crimes?

If then, punishments, not corrective in their nature, have been visibly displayed before the eyes of the world—if they are left on record for "our admonition on whom the ends of the world have come;"—why, we ask, may not punishments of a similar character, reach the case of those in another world, who, in this, "fill up the measure" of their iniquities, who "have *no hope* in their death but are *driven away in their wickedness*,"—especially, as the Scriptures give us this representation, and only this representation, of them? "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?"

We read of some, to whom God, it was said, should send "strong delusion" and that for a specified purpose. Now what was this purpose? On the Universalist scheme, it must be for a gracious purpose, to promote their good; for according to this system, all judicial visitations, as well as others, have, and cannot but have, a beneficial, a gracious object in view—whether inflicted here or hereafter the good of the parties concerned is kept steadily in view. But with all due deference to the superior judgments of our opponents, we take the liberty of saying this was not the object; but the specified purpose of sending the "strong delusion" to those who "received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved" was their DAMNATION; and we form our belief of this upon the explicit testimony of St. Paul, an inspired Apostle, who, it is reasonable to suppose, without intend-

ing any affront to our "*very learned friends*," was, at least, as well acquainted with his MASTER'S WILL, as any Universalist-Divine under the sun. For fear we might" be charged with being "wise above that which is written," we quote the passage in full. "Because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And *for this cause* God shall send them strong delusion that they should *believe a lie*: that they *all might be damned* who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. ii. 10—12. To reconcile this passage with the tenets of Universalism, we think, would be a difficult, if not a hopeless task.

Again:—if future punishments be corrective in their nature and designed for the spiritual benefit of the suffering parties, we should naturally suppose that God would *ever* be "found" of those who "seek" him, and "near" to save those who "call upon him." But there is a time in this world, as well as in the future world, when we are informed, that God *will not* be *near to them who call upon him*, nor be *found of those who seek him. In this world.* "Because *I called* and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh; &c. THEN *shall* they *call upon me*, BUT I *will not answer;* they shall *seek me early*, BUT *they shall not find me:* for they hated knowledge and did not choose the fear of the Lord: they would none of my counsel: they despised all my reproof. Therefore, shall they eat of their own way, and be filled with their own devices." Prov. i. 24—32. In the world *to come.* "And they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut. Afterward came also the other (the foolish) virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said"—(what? wait—and after you have suffered for such a length of time, I will open

the door of heaven and admit you to myself:—no, but,) "verily I say unto you, I know you not." Matt. xxv. 10 -12. "When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are—depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity." Luke xiii. 25—27. On this leading principle of the Bible, we are exhorted.—"Seek ye the Lord while he *may be found; call* ye upon him while he *is near.*" Is. lv. 6.

Again:—"If the punishment of hell be a mere wholesome discipline, then what the Apostle says of the discipline of christians in this life, may be said with equal truth and propriety of the punishment of the damned: thus, We glory in damnation, knowing that damnation worketh repentance and repentance salvation."(9)

Lastly: &c. We are taught to ascribe our salvation to God and the Lamb, and that the ascription of this praise, will be the burden of the songs of the redeemed in heaven. "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred and tongue, and people and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, &c. heard I saying, blessing, and honour and glory and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." Rev. v. 9—13.

But, if the punishment, inflicted upon the damned be corrective and should prove efficacious in purifying and saving *their* souls, and introducing them to the society of

(9) President Edward's Treatise.

the heavenly world, the burden of their song, amid the hallelujahs of the glorified saints, will be—*not* unto the Lamb, or him that sitteth on the throne—BUT—unto HELL-FIRE be ALL the glory of OUR SALVATION! Horrid! Can the idea be ever entertained, that the Deity Himself, by emendatory sufferings in another world, will give occasion for notes, so harsh and discordant, to disturb the soft and holy symphonies, harmonious as the music of the spheres, which, raised in honour of Himself, and of the Lamb, swell through the lofty arches of Heaven? It is impossible; and yet this would follow, were future punishment merely corrective in its nature. Future punishment, therefore is not corrective, or designed for the good of those who suffer the vengeance of an infinitely holy and offended GOD.

A consideration of the other means will be found in the next Chapter.

Chapter VIII.

Same subject continued—the word of God, read or preached, not a means used for the recovery of the damned—nor the sanctified efforts of the pious—nor the mediatorial and intercessory offices of Christ—nor the influence of the holy spirit—objection, that God can work without as well as with means, answered.

Having shown that the means for the salvation of the damned, cannot be the punishment itself, we come now to consider whether they are to be found in the particulars mentioned in a preceding page. (1)

The *word of God* read or preached, was stated to be *one* means of present salvation. "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. i. 15. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Id. x. 17. "In whom ye also trusted after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation." Eph. i. 13.

It should also be remembered, that it is the gospel as it *now* is which is the power of God unto salvation, and not another. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal. i. 8.

(1) See Page.

Again :—According to the present economy of grace, preachers of the Gospel are necessary, as instruments, to accomplish the Divine purposes respecting the salvation of men. "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, &c. Mark xvi. 15. 16. "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they hear without a preacher? "Rom. x. 13. 14.

Quere :—*Will the damned be favoured with the* WORD OF GOD for their *own perusal*—or with the MINISTRY of that WORD ? *Answer* No.

Not for their own perusal:—In the *intermediate* state, it is probable, they could not read it, if they possessed it; and we know of no spirits that take with them into the other world, a copy of the Sacred Volume. If the Universalists do, they have, we acknowledge, over us a decided advantage. *After* the Judgment, it is probable, if not certain, that all the Bibles and Testaments will be no more, as doubtless they will have been destroyed by the great and general conflagration, when "the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." 2 Pet. iii. 10. *In* the *day* of dread decision itself, it is also more than probable, that the "wicked" will be too busily employed in "hiding themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains, and crying to the rocks and mountains to fall on them and hide them from the face of him that sitteth on the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb,"—to secure, were it possible, from the general wreck, the precious Bible, which in this world, they neglected, and perhaps, discredited.

Nor is there any certainty of their being favoured with the MINISTRY of the WORD. All, who in this world, ministered "in the word and doctrine," will at the close of life, "rest from their labours" and receive their eternal

"reward." They shall be "EVER with the Lord"—(not in hell) and "pillars in the temple of their God, and shall go *no more out*"—and "they shall reign (not *preach*) for ever and ever." Rev. iii. 12 : 22. 5. The point is fully decided by the declaration of our Lord, when, in describing the absolutely hopeless condition of Dives, he says, "and besides all this, between us and you (that is between heaven and hell) there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to YOU CANNOT; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence." Luke xvi. 26. This passage is sufficient to satisfy the minds of all who believe the Bible. *Angels* as well as glorified men are hereby prevented from overstepping the impassable gulf on errands of mercy : *From hence*, means, "heaven"—angels are inhabitants of heaven—angels, therefore, *cannot* pass from heaven to the abodes of eternal misery, to drop the least alleviation from their wings.

We stated, that the *sanctified efforts of the pious* were another means of present salvation. The righteous are the salt of the earth. Matt. v. 13. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." James v. 16. "Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." Id. 20. v.

Quere :—*Will the miserable outcasts from the mercy of God* have the *society*, the *examples*, the *exhortations*, the *prayers* of the *righteous*, which they despised in this world ? *Answer* No.

Not one solitary "Child of God" will ever walk that land of darkness, lamentation and woe, with the message of reconciliation, to entreat them to be at peace with God, or to supplicate on their blasted, cursed spirits the refreshing dews of heavenly grace. O HELL! how cheerless are thine abodes! *The gulf is still fixed;* and none that might desire to go as a messenger of consolation,

can pass the bounds, which the decree of God has established and declared to be impassable to saint or sinner.

The *Meditorial* and *Intercessory offices of* CHRIST were mentioned as another means of salvation ; and so necessary are these, that, without them no flesh living can be saved. "Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God." 1 Pet. iii. 18. "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." Heb. vii. 25. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts iv. 12.

Quere :—*Will*, then, *those*, who *in this life, contemned the Saviour, esteemed and loved him not*, but *contumeliously* and *perseveringly rejected his salvation, be blest, in Hell, with an interest in the mediation* and *intercession of Christ ? Answer* No.

For such, "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." Heb. x. 26. 27. The "barren fig tree" was spared year after year at the instance of the intercessor, and was at last respited another year, on the condition, that if the means employed should prove successful all should be well; if not, then afterwards it should be cut down—a statement, which discovers, that, on the failure of the means, the vine-dresser, the intercessor himself would acquiesce in the doom of the worthless tree and no more intercede in its behalf. All this has a spiritual meaning, and is in proof that there is a point beyond which the intercession of Christ itself may not go. At all events, it we would be the height of absurdity, to suppose, that, after He had himself, as Judge, condemned, and pronounced the doom of the finally impenitent at the Judgement Day, he would intercede for the mitigation or the suspension of the

punishment he himself had appointed; and yet to this absurdity are they driven, who advocate the interest of the damned in the intercession of the Saviour. "Christ will no longer be their Mediator and Intercessor; for, at the resurrection, CHRIST is the Judge. The Scriptures designate CHRIST as the one appointed to judge the world. And can he be JUDGE and ADVOCATE too? or, after having adjudged them to pain and woe, will he turn their Advocate? and if he does, for what will he intercede? That the extent of his judgment may not be executed upon them? or, will he intercede that they may not suffer any more than he decided they should? The former would be inconsistent; they latter unnecessary. For when Divine Justice is satisfied, it will not need the pleas of an Advocate to induce it to with-hold its hand. But this question seems to be decided by Scripture. At the resurrection, Christ gives up the kingdom to his Father."(2) "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. xv. 24. 28. The kingdom here spoken of is the *mediatorial* kingdom, in which, among other things, existed the intercession of Christ; but the end coming, and there being no longer any necessity for the administration of the kingdom of GRACE, the kingdom itself is yielded up to the Father, and a termination is consequently put to all acts of mercy to sinners, and to all intercessions on their account. The administration of the kingdom of GRACE being finally closed;--there being no longer a state of *probation*, "and consequently no longer need of a distinction between the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory; then the SON, as being man, shall cease to exercise any

(2) *Dr. Fisk's Sermon.*

distinct dominion; and *God be all in all*, there remaining no longer any distinction in the persons of the glorious Trinity, as acting any distinct or separate parts in either the kingdom of grace, or the kingdom of glory: and so the one infinite essence shall appear undivided and eternal." (3) On the 28 v. Whitby has the following Comment. "He saith not that the Father, mentioned ver. 24. but that GOD may be all in all; and so he seems to lead us to that interpretation of the Godhead which comprehends Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and then the import of the phrase that GOD *may be all in all*, will be this, that the Godhead may govern all things immediately by himself, without the intervention of a MEDIATOR between him and us, to exact our obedience in his name, and convey to us his favours and rewards, we being then to tender all our duty immediately to him, and derive all our happiness immediately from him. So that as now Christ *Theanthropos*, God-man, *is all in all*, Col. iii. 11, because the Father hath put all things, into his hands, does all things, and governs all things by him, when this economy ceases, the Godhead alone will be all in all, as governing and influencing all things by himself immediately."

Nor would it follow, as a natural consequence, that were Christ, after the close of life, to intercede for sinners, his intercession would prove effectual, either to move the Father to save them, or produce reformation in themselves, were this even possible. His intercessions for them whilst in time were far from bringing them to repentance; "because the sentence against their evil works, was, at His instance, not executed speedily, their hearts were only more fully set in them to do evil;" Eccl. viii. 11. and for their long continued perversity, their wilful and obstinate rejection of proffered mercy, their determined yet inexcusable "neglect of the great salvation," purchased at a price so dear and burdened with

(3) Dr. A. Clarke, in loc.

them, suffering justly for their aggravated crimes, as he said of ancient rebellious Israel—"Pray not thou for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession to me: for I WILL NOT hear thee." Jer. vii. 16.

The last means of salvation, which we mentioned, we stated to be, the influence of the HOLY SPIRIT leading to repentance and faith in Christ and promotive of holiness and obedience. "He (the Comforter, or Spirit) will reprove (convince) the world of sin, and righteousness and judgment." John xvi. 8. "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Gal. v. 22. 23. "Ye are sanctified by the spirit of our God." 1 Cor. vi. 11. "Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth thro' the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren." 1 Pet. i. 12.

Quere:—*Have we any proof* that *the influence*, the *operation of this* DIVINE SPIRIT *extends to the* "LOST" *in another world*? Answer—*none whatever*, but much to the contrary.

"My spirit shall not *always* strive with man," is the language of Deity itself on this subject. Gen. vi. 3. Now, if this were spoken of sinners in this world, how absurd is it to suppose that he must necessarily strive hereafter with obdurated offenders, who, in this life, resisted all his motions!—If the spirit of God, not unfrequently, abandons the wilfully hardened sinner in this world, before the term of natural life expires, and that as a judicial visitation, something more than the mere opinion or *ipse dixit* of an erring mortal is required to satisfy our minds, that He will re-commence his operations on the hearts of persons in another world; especially, as the Scriptures are not only silent as to this being the case, but as the persons themselves are placed in a state, by the direct in-

terference of God, in which they are said to have received "judgment WITHOUT mercy."

Again :—none can *repent* without the agency of the Divine Spirit ; but of some it is said, "it is impossible to renew them unto *repentance*"—Heb. vi. 6. With such there is no determination on the part of the Spirit to strive. If this were said of characters then in time, how unscriptural, is it to expect that they will be "renewed to repentance" in eternity !

Again :—We cannot obtain forgiveness, but thro' the blood of Christ, applied to the conscience by the Spirit; but there is a sin, of which it is said, "it shall not be forgiven neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Matt. xii. 32. It is evident on the very face of the passage, that the opinion, which makes the phrase "this world" mean the "old dispensation" and "the world to come" the "New," is unfounded. For 1. Christ is the Speaker. 2. He could not, as a man of sense, laying aside a consideration of his Divinity, call a dispensation *then* PAST "*this* world," and a dispensation *then* PRESENT "the world *to come*." It is also carefully to be observed, that the phrase, "*shall* not *be* forgiven," cannot by any proper grammatical construction be made to refer to a dispensation *already past;* for this would be to employ a *future tense*, to point out *time past*, which would be an absolute contradiction. But there is no grammatical impropriety in applying *that tense* to the *present* dispensation; for, tho' at the time the words commented upon were spoken, it had but commenced, yet the greater portion of it was still future. Nor must it be overlooked, that the phrase "shall not be forgiven" implies that the person guilty of this sin shall be punished, not by temporal death, or temporal visitations only, but by eternal death or sufferings; for, tho' temporal death or temporal punishments can be inflicted "in this world," they cannot have existence "in the world to come"—to suppose the contrary,

would be to suppose a contradiction, an impossibility—and yet, according to our Saviour, the non-forgiveness, or punishment extends to "the world to come" as well as to "this world." With this view of the subject agrees the parallel passage in MARK;—"he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath *never* forgiveness, but is in danger of ETERNAL damnation." Mark iii. 29. "This phrase, *It shall not be forgiven him, neither in this life, nor in the world to come,*" is equivalent to "shall NEVER at any future time be forgiven; hence Mark expresses it, 'is in danger of eternal damnation'. Nor is 'the world' or age 'to come' to be understood, with others, of the age of the Messiah; for that had already commenced. The expression, as appears from similar phrases in the later Jewish writers, was proverbial for never." (4) St Luke, also, employs the most positive terms, and absolutely declares, that the person guilty of the sin in question, *ouk affesetai*, "shall not be forgiven." Luke xii. 10.

Here then, there is, at least, one undeniable instance of a sin unpardonable in either world, and punishable consequently with "eternal damnation." To say that the Holy Spirit strives with an individual guilty of an unpardonable sin, to lead him to repentance, or faith in Christ, and thro' these to forgiveness, is to assert the greatest absurdity.

"Again; the nature of this punishment excludes all those works to which the promise of heaven is made. These are, as has been proved, *faith* and its *fruits*. Nothing is more clearly revealed in the book of GOD, than that faith is the medium thro' which a meetness for heaven is communicated to the soul. But what chance for faith in eternity? 'Now faith,' says the Apostle to the Hebrews, 'is the substance of things hoped for; and the evidence of things not seen.' xi. 1. v. The certainty of sight and sense is perfectly incompatible with faith. But

(4) *R Watson, in loc.*

in eternity that record which God has given of invisible things, and which he requires us to believe as necessary to salvation, will be known to be true by open vision. Is he, who would come to God here, commanded to "believe that God *is*, and that he *is* the rewarder of them that diligently seek him"? There, these truths will no longer be matters of faith, but of certain knowledge. He that has been judged at God's bar, will know that he *is*; and he that has heard the righteous, in his presence, welcomed into everlasting habitations, will know that God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. Must he, who would be saved, believe that Christ is the Redeemer and Saviour of the world? In eternity, the sinner will know that he is so; for he has seen the righteous admitted to heaven thro' receiving him, and finds himself thrust down to Hell for rejecting him. Is he called upon to believe in the HOLY SPIRIT? He now knows that he is suffering 'sorer punishment,' for doing "despite unto that Spirit." In short, every one must see, that at the Judgment, or after, it is impossible to exercise that faith, which we are here required to exercise in order to salvation. And as there is no opportunity for faith so there is none for its fruits. How can there be fruits when there is nothing to produce them? Besides, it will be readily seen, that there can be no opportunity to 'fight the good fight of faith' in hell." There can therefore be no operation of the Spirit in hell to produce "faith" when faith there cannot exist.

If no faith, there can be no "love" in Hell. For love is a consequence of faith. In the first verses of the 5th Romans, the immediate fruits of justifying faith are stated; among these is mentioned love; and love is said to be "shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." But if no love, there can be no Spirit there to shed it abroad in the hearts of the damned. Again :—"We love God because he first loved us:" our

love so unparalled and immense, the Father might say of love of God results from an apprehension, an assurance of his love of us, obtained by faith; we cannot love God until we know that he loves us. But "God is *angry* with the wicked;" the damned are under *wrath;* therefore, whilst this is the case, it is utterly impossible, that they can love God.

If no love there can be no *holiness;* for the perfection of love is scriptural holiness. Nor can there be in Hell any religious *obedience;* for love is the root of all religious and accepted obedience. "This is the love of God (the effect of it) that we keep his commandments." John v. 3. If then there be no love, there can be no obedience. Besides it is easy to show, that there are many commandments, which cannot possibly be obeyed in another world. For instance;—"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy"—"Honour thy father and thy mother"—"Thou shalt not kill"—"Thou shalt not commit adultery"—"Thou shalt not steal"—Feed the hungry—Clothe the naked—Visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions—Given to hospitality; &c. and these instances might be enlarged.

"Unless then," to use the words of the author last quoted, "the very constitution of the place of salvation is changed; unless the most essential principles of the Gospel are given up; in short, unless there is some other way of getting to heaven, beside the one revealed in the Bible, there is no hope that the future miseries of the damned will ever be exchanged for the joys of heaven."(5)

To every unprejudiced mind, the above observations, we apprehend, are sufficient to show, that the discipline in the future state, so strenuously contended for, by the Universalists, is not. 1. The punishment itself. 2. The Word of God read or preached. 3. The sanctified efforts of the righteous. 4. The Mediatorial and Intercessory offices of Christ. or 5. The influence of the Holy Spirit,

(5) *Dr. Fisk's Sermon.*

leading to repentance, and faith in Christ, and promotive of love and obedience;—and as these comprehend all the MEANS that can reasonably be supposed to be employed in another state for saving purposes, we are warranted in concluding that the absence of these implies the absence of all others.

But to this it may be objected, God can work as well *without* as *with* means. We reply, the objection, whilst it certainly gives up the probationary character of the future state, does not relieve the difficulty. As to what God *can* do, there is no doubt. All things not implying an impossibility, and a violation of his veracity, or any other of his attributes, assuredly come within the range of his Power. But let us suppose a case. For reasons satisfactory to himself, the Deity declares that no unholy soul can be admitted to heaven, but at the termination of natural life, shall be cast into Hell:—he determines to make none holy but those, who *repent* and *believe* in Christ, and that none can thus repent and believe except in *this life*, no provision for the exercise of these fruits of the Spirit in the future world being made :—then, we are warranted in affirming, that the Deity himself *cannot* take an unholy soul, as such, *out of hell*, that, in *this life*, *repented not*, and *believed not*, neither was *made holy*, and *place it in heaven* with his sanctified and glorified saints. This, in a moral sense, is as *impossible*, as, in a physical sense, it is for a thing *to be* and *not to be* in the same moment of time. For the contrary of this would make the God of Truth a LIAR ! But it is "impossible for GOD to lie." Heb. vi. 8. Hence, if the case supposed be the real doctrine of the Scripture, which it undoubtedly is, as will appear from the preceding Chapters of this work,—then, the doctrine of future restoration and the *use of means to that effect*, falls to the ground; and it is well, if in the greatness of its fall, it overwhelms not many of the sons and daughters of Universalism in its ruins.

Again:—Admitting that the Deity *can* act as the objection supposes, yet, a question of the greatest moment in the discussion, remains to be determined; and that is, *Will* God save from future torment without means, those, who in this world, wilfully "set at nought his counsel and would have none of his reproof"? A mere possibility of this event, were there no obstruction, is surely not sufficient to satisfy the mind deeply concerned for its eternal well-being. Now to ascertain what the Lord will do in this matter, recourse must necessarily be had to his *written word*; for further then this word declares we know not. "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." "For who hath known the mind of the Lord?" Rom. viii. 20. Unless therefore it can be shown from the Word of God, that he has *promised* to save the finally impenitent from future misery, or to rescue them *out of* their "prison," *without means*, nothing of certainty can be drawn from his mere Power, to support the notion that, on the supposition of no obstacle intervening, he will absolutely so exert his Power. But, if the doctrine of the strict eternity of future punishment be the doctrine of the Scriptures, which, we have already shown, is the case, then no such promise of future restoration, either *with or without* means, can be found in the Sacred Oracles,—otherwise they would contain the most palpable contradictions, which we have before proved impossible.

Again:—In confirmation of our views of the question now under discussion, we remark, there is reason to believe, that God wills men to be actually saved in this life, and for this purpose grants them every necessary asistance; but that if they improve not their present advantages, his determination is, not to afford them any other. This determination necessarily arises out of the circumstance of this life being our only probationary

state; and, as such, necessarily referring to a future state, where all is fixed, unchangeable, and eternal. Nothing short, therefore, is it of downright presumption, to expect other assistances in the future world; especially as the Scriptures exhibit not the slightest encouragement on which to build such an expectation, but employ the strongest language declarative of the reverse.

"Wherefore (as the Holy Ghost saith,) *To day* if ye will hear his voice, *harden not your hearts*, as in the provocation in the wilderness: when your fathers tempted me and saw my works forty years. Wherefore I was grieved with that generation and said, They do alway err in their hearts; and they have not known my ways. So I *swear in my wrath*, they *shall not enter into my rest.*" Heb. iii. 7—11. This passage, in its primary application, it is granted, refers to the coming short of the Israelites of Canaan, to the land of promise. But, in this particular, their history reads to subsequent ages, especially to professing Christans, an awfully admonitory lesson. They came short of Canaan, a type of heaven:—to put them in possession of it no means were subsequently employed:—they perished in the wilderness and their loss was irreparable. To caution us against coming short of the heavenly rest, the Apostle seizes on this piece of history and holds it up to our contemplation as a most instructive lesson; for, in this case, *i. e.* coming short of heaven, as well as in the other, no subsequent means will be employed to bring us to the promised land of eternal felicity, and the loss thus sustained can never be repaired.

If this be not the meaning of the Apostle in the verse just quoted, he means nothing in the following exhortations.—"Wherefore, take heed brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God. But exhort one another daily, while it is called To-day; lest any of you be hardened through the

deceitfulness of sin." Id. 12. 13. v. "So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief." 19. v. "Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem (*dokē*, *actually*) come short of it." iv. 1. v. "Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief." 12. v. Now, why should they "take heed" lest by unbelief they depart from the living God—why should they "labour" lest they "fall"—or why should they even "fear" (there is no *fear* in the Universalist's creed) lest they "come short" of future and eternal rest, —if, after this life there are other opportunities, and other and more abundant means to secure an entrance "into the kingdom of heaven?" Are they thus exhorted on the principles of Universalism? No. They are exhorted thus, only on the ground, that living and dying in their sins, their departure from God, their fall from their uprightness, their coming short of heaven, will be of an *eternal* character.

CHAPTER IX.

OBJECTIONS, FROM 1 PET. iii. 18—20—1 PET. iv. 6. AND 1 COR. iii. 15, ANSWERED.

To the general scope of the last Chapter, several objections are urged, taken professedly from the Scriptures; to answer which is the object of the present Chapter.

Asks a self-confident Universalist, *Does not* ST. PETER, *affirm that* CHRIST *by his* SPIRIT "*went and preached unto the Spirits in Prison,*" i. e. in Hell? —We subjoin the whole passage. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the Ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls were saved by water." 1 Peter iii: 18, —20.—The following comment, by a distinguished Divine, is very satisfactory and perfectly agreeable to the Analogy of faith.—"By attributing the preaching of the Ancient prophets to Christ, the Apostle hath taught us that *from the beginning* the economy of man's redemption has been under the direction of Christ. *To the spirits in prison*—that is, which *were* in prison *when* St. Peter wrote this Epistle. They were *men in the flesh when* Christ preached to them by His Spirit speaking in

Noah; but *after* they were *dead*, their spirits were shut up in the infernal prison, detained like the fallen angels, Jude 6 v. unto the judgment of the great day: *which sometime, pote, once*, or formerly, *were disobedient, when the long suffering of God* waited, for their repentance, *in the days of Noah;* during the long space of 120 years, while the Ark was preparing; during which time Noah warned them all to repent, and flee from the wrath to come."(6)

Adopting this view of the subject, the following propositions are deducible from this passage.—1. The persons here spoken of are the *Antedeluvians*. 2. God had threatened their destruction, and, that they might repent and avert their threatened doom, gave them the space of 120 years.—3. To enable them to repent, and induce them so to do, CHRIST as the HEAD OF THE CHURCH *from the beginning*, "preached unto them by his Spirit" *through* NOAH, who is on this account, styled "*a preacher of righteousness.*" 2. Pet. ii. 2. 5.—4. This preaching must have taken place *while they* and *Noah* were *in this world*; for by preparing the Ark (an act of *time*) he is said to have "*condemned the world;*" Heb. xi. 7. and according to the passage under consideration, it was, "*whilst* the ark was preparing," that the long suffering of God waited *in the days* of Noah." 5. In consequence of continued and final impenitence and disobedience they were destroyed and their bodies being dead, their *souls* were placed in *hell*, the *prison house* of God.(7) 6. Their "spirits" had continued in hell *until*, and were in prison *when* St. Peter wrote; and it was to their then *present* state he referred, when declaring them to be "in prison," and not to their past state when Christ went by his Spirit and preached unto them thro' Noah.

(6) Benson in loc.

(7) In proof that *hell* is set forth as a "prison" see Matt. v. 25. 2 Pet. ii. 4. 5. Rev. xx. 7.

We are inclined to think that *apeithēsasi pote*, rendered, *which were some time disobedient*, should be read *parenthetically*: the passage then would read thus—"*by which he went and preached unto the spirits in prison* (which were some time disobedient) *when once the long suffering of God waited*, &c." By this method, the time of the preaching in question would be more explicitly pointed out, limiting it to the time *when* the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah. Our version places a *semicolon* at the end of the 19th v. thereby almost disjointing the 20th from it, or at least destroying in a great measure the intimate connection between them. In the original the punctuation is different:—in Griesbach's edition and in the common editions, of the Greek Testament, it is well known that, the above phrase is placed between *two commas*, which circumstance very often has the force of a parenthesis;—and it is evident on the face of the passage, that, the design of the Apostle was not so much to inform us of the precise time of their disobedience, as it was to inform us of the time in which Chirst by his Spirit preached unto them, which was, *when* they were *disobedient* and the *long suffering* of God *waited* in the *days of Noah.*

But if the above passage be not read parenthetically, the same object will be attained by rendering *apeithēsasi pote*, "*when* they were disobedient." That *pote* will bear this translation is evident from Mark xiii. 33,35. "Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye now not (*pote*) *when* the time is." "Watch ye therefore: for ye know not (*pote*) when the master of the house cometh" &c. By this mode the time of our Lord's preaching to these persons will be limited to the period when they were disobedient; and consequently when they were in the body; and the latter part of the verse "when the long suffering of God waited, &c," will be exegetical of the time of their disobedience, or more properly, explanatory, also, of the time when our Saviour

preached unto them by his Spirit. On either of these proposed plans of rendering, every difficulty will be removed, and the harmony of this passage with the whole tenor of the Sacred Scriptures on the question at issue placed in the strongest light:—not, let it be distinctly understood, that we for a moment suppose the present version in the least degree countenances the Universalist-belief of the use of future disciplinary means. For whatever becomes of the above criticisms, our proposition stands untouched—that the Apostle, in declaring these "spirits" to be "in prison," refers to their state when he wrote, and not to their past state, when, as men in the body, Christ, by His Spirit, went and preached unto them.(8) On this principle, this celebrated passage makes directly against Universalism, instead of favouring its delusive and pernicious doctrines. These spirits had been "in prison," in pain and suffering, "in chains of darkness" and under condemnation from the time of the flood until the time in which St. Peter wrote his first Epistle :—a period of no less than 2408 years,—a strange circumstance on the restoration scheme !—At least, we might expect, that during 2408 years, the *means* employed for their liberation, if any there were, would ere that have opened the prison doors and set the Captives free ! But after 2408 years of suffering, an inspired Apostle decides they were still in prison, and even then not a hint is given of their final rescue.

Again:—It is asked with triumph, *Does not St. Peter say* that *the Gospel* is *preached to the* DEAD? The verse to which reference is here made, reads thus;—"For for this

(8) After writing the above, we referred to the translation of the New Testament by CHARLES THOMSON, Esq. and were not a little pleased on reading his translation of the passage in question, which is as follows ;—"Brought to life by that Spirit with which he went, and to the spirits which *are* (*now*) in prison made proclamation *at the time they were disobedient*—when the long suffering of God was waiting once for all in the days of Noah &c." This substantially agrees with our views expressed above.

cause *was* (not *is*) the Gospel preached also to them that *are* dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit." 1 Pet. iv. 6. Mr. Wesley's note on this verse, tho' brief, well expresses the meaning of the Apostle. "*For to this end was the gospel preached.* Ever since it was given to Adam: *to them that are now dead*—In their several generations, that they might be judged—That though they were judged, *in the flesh according* to the manner of *men*—with rash, unrighteous judgment, *they might live according to* the will and word of *God*, in the Spirit; the soul renewed after his image." To every person, it must be evident, on a little reflection, that the time of the preaching was *past* —*was*, or *has been* preached. And that the period, to which the Apostle refers in stating the persons to be "dead," was *then present*—"are," that is, *now* at the *present time*, "dead." So that this verse has nothing to do with the doctrine of future restoration, or with *means* used for the salvation of the "lost."

Again:—Another passage, supposed to refer to the use of *means* for the deliverance of the wicked from a place of future punishment, is pressed into the service of Universalism:—the passage is 1 Cor. iii. 15. We adduce the verses in connexion. " For *other foundation* can no man lay than that is laid, which is JESUS CHRIST. Now if any man *build upon this foundation*, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he *hath built* thereupon, he shall receive a reward." Then follows the verse in question;—" If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." Hence, the Universalists, at once, conclude, that *all sinners*, the veriest villains in the world, *will be saved by purification of fire:*—with how much truth we shall now endeavour to show.

1. Christ is the foundation. 2. The builders, particularly referred to, are ministers, tho' others also may be included. 3. By the gold, silver, precious stones, are intended scriptural doctrines:—by wood, hay, stubble, erroneous doctrines. 4. Every man's work shall be tried—the day, mentioned also in the 5. v. of the next Chapter, is the judgment day,(9) at which time his work shall be tried, as metal is tried in the fire, and its true character ascertained. 5. The man, who, has built on Christ—and we build upon him only by a loving, operative faith, a faith which works by love and purifies the heart—and has maintained pure scriptural doctrines, shall receive a reward, as St. John expresses it, "a full reward." 6. But the man, who, either thro' unavoidable ignorance or the prejudice of education, has mingled with his living faith in Christ, erroneous doctrines, shall suffer loss, shall not receive that "full reward," which otherwise would have been his portion :—his erroneous doctrines, not standing the test, and being shown to have been prejudicial to the true interests of Christ's kingdom on earth, shall be destroyed, as wood, hay, stubble, are by the action of material fire; yet, he himself, having been on the whole *sincere*, tho' the subject of ignorance and prejudice, shall be saved from eternal misery, yet, so as by fire—not *by* fire absolutely, for the expression is certainly figurative, but (*os dia puros*) so as by fire,—"as narrowly as a man escapes thro' the fire, when his house is all in flames about him."(1) "Yet so as by fire, i. e. with great difficulty; a mere escape; a hair's breadth deliverance; he shall be like a brand plucked out of the fire. The Apostle obviously refers to the case of a man, who having builded a house, and begun to dwell in it, the house happens to be set on fire, and he has warning of it, just in time to escape with his life; loosing, at the same time his house, his goods, his labour, and almost

(9) Wesley in loc. (1) Ib.

his own life. So he, who, while he holds the doctrine of Christ crucified, as the only foundation on which a soul can rest its hopes of salvation; builds at the same time, on that foundation, *Antinomianism*, or any other erroneous or destructive doctrine, he shall loose all his labour and his own soul scarcely escape everlasting perdition; nor even this, unless sheer ignorance and inveterate prejudice connected with much sincerity, be found in his case."(2) The evident meaning of the passage is, as stated by Dr. Tillotson, "that men may hold all the fundamentals of religion, and yet may superadd other things whereby they may greatly endanger their salvation;" and it "intimates that it will be difficult for those that corrupt and deprave Christianity to be saved."

It is worthy of remark that the persons spoken of as being saved "so as by fire," are those who *build* on the true and only foundation; v. 11. 12. so, we are willing to allow, that a Universalist, who *builds on* CHRIST *by a living operative faith*, and, under circumstances of unavoidable ignorance and inveterate prejudice, mingled with much sincerity, retains his unscriptural and exceedingly dangerous notions, will be saved, but with difficulty, whilst his wood, hay, stubble-like opinions will be utterly destroyed. But from this, it cannot, surely, with the least show of reason or propriety, be concluded, that the "ungodly" the "wicked,"—those who *reject Christ* the foundation, build not upon him, receive him not either as prophet, priest, or king,—who cavil at his word, deny his atonement, ridicule his religion, and live and die in their sins, will share in this salvation, even if it be "so as by fire."

But if it be contended that the "fire" mentioned, is actual, material fire, and, as such, is used as a means of purification; we answer 1. This assumption precludes the possibility of any soul being restored *before* the re-

(2) *Dr. A. Clark in loc.*

surrection; as, in the intermediate state, there is no material fire; or if there were, being material it could not in the very nature of things, have any purifying effect upon the soul, an immaterial principle. That none can be restored *before* the resurrection, is also the doctrine of the Scripture; for *they that have done evil*, in this world, shall, at the sound of the trump, *come forth unto the resurrection of damnation.* John v. 29.

We answer 2. The above assumption destroys the doctrine of restoration *after* the Judgment. The *trial* is to take place *at*, not *after*, the judgment day; "for *the day* shall declare it, for *it* is revealed by fire;" and, the man, whose work is tried, and burned up, and who suffers the mentioned loss, will be *saved* (not *put in the fire*, but *saved*) "so *as* by fire," *on the day of trial*, the day of judgment, not *afterwards.* Hence, if any at the Judgment day be adjudged to Hell, the sentence will not be executed until *after* the day of trial is over. This, also is confirmed by the decisions of the Sacred Scriptures, as from St. Matthew's Gospel we undoudtedly learn, that, it is not *until* the Judgment *is closed* and the sentence of "depart ye cursed" is pronounced, the "wicked" with their united bodies and souls, "go away into everlasting punishment." If, therefore, "fire" be employed either as an instrument of punishment, or as an alledged means of purification, it must be *so* employed *after* the day of "dread decision" is terminated, and not *before.* If then this be the case, all hope of being saved afterwards is excluded by this verse; for, as above stated, the salvation spoken of in it is to be experienced *at* the judgment day and not *subsequently.* The same conclusion appears manifest from the consideration, that, *after* the judgment, the *fire of Hell* can have no more effect of a purifying nature on the soul, than material fire could have had *before* that event; and tho' it *can* and *will* cause pain to the *body*, yet pain endured by the body in the way of

punishment, can never impart a purifying, saving influence to the soul, unassailable by any material, painful agent. Hence there is nothing in 1 Cor. iii. 15, when properly explained to countenance the baseless and ruinous delusion of the use of disciplinary means for saving purposes in a place of future punishment.

Chapter X.

THE DOCTRINE, THAT THE DESIGN OF THE MEANS, IF ANY, TO BE HEREAFTER USED IS TO RESTORE THE SOULS OF THE DAMNED TO THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, SHOWN TO BE UNSCRIPTURAL.

THIRD POINT: *Is it the doctrine of Scripture, that the* DESIGN *of the means,* if any, *to be hereafter used, is to* RESTORE *the souls of the damned to the* KINGDOM OF HEAVEN *?" Answer* No.

To this question we reply in the negative; assured that, whilst no passage can be found in the Sacred Volume, which either expressly or by implication states the affirmative, there are many passages which are in direct and positive opposition to such an opinion.

Let it also be remembered, as formerly remarked, SCRIPTURE cannot contradict itself—cannot teach two doctrines as opposed to each other as light is to darkness and *vice versa.*

The following quotations are submitted as bearing upon the question at issue.

"If thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter *into life* maimed, than having two hands to go *into hell,* into the fire that *never* shall be quenched:—where *their* worm *dieth not,* and the *fire* is *not quenched.*" Mark ix. 43. 44. The contrast here is between "life" or heaven, and "hell," which is here decided to be, a *place* of *quenchless fire* and of the *deathless worm,* remorse of

conscience; and if the words of our Saviour have any meaning, they mean that the *experience of one* of these places, necessarily and for ever *excludes that of the other.* There is most certainly *no mention* of any *design* of means being employed to quench the flames, destroy the worm, and restore to the enjoyment of "life" the souls that are once *cast into hell*; but the whole case is so stated, as, of set purpose, to shut out all idea of the existence of such design. The solemn injunction of our Lord to avoid pleasing and profitable sins is thrice repeated in this Chapter, and enforced by a thrice repetition of the awful motive just quoted;—which evidently shows of what unutterable importance and absolute necessity it is for persons so to conduct in this world as to escape the interminable miseries of the place of future torment. Nor must it be forgotten, that in these expressions, the *strict eternity* of future punishment is explicitly stated, without the use of the disputed word *aionios*, but in terms which will forever withstand the united force of sarcasm and distorted criticism. *Their worm, ou teleuta, non moritur, dies not; the fire, ou sbennutai, non extinguit, is not extinguished, comes not to an end.*

Mr. Watson's note on the words of the 48th v. is worthy of attention and is as follows. "These words are similar to Isaiah lxvi. 24; but even there they may be used as a *proverbial* description of *hopeless* and *utter destruction*, and so there may be no application of them by our Lord, except as the expression was well known as proverbial. Bishop Lowth and others think the allusion in Isaiah is to the valley of Hinnom, where the idolatrous Jews made their children to pass through the fire to Moloch. Josiah desecrated or defiled it; and it was the custom to keep fires perpetually burning there to consume the filth and offal of the City. This might indeed, explain the allusion to *unquenchable fire*, but not that to the *worm that dieth not;* and the notion of Lowth, that

this valley was also a common burying-place, and so furnished the image of the ever-gnawing worm, as well as that of the everlasting fire, is without sufficient proof. In so polluted a place the Jews were unlikely to bury their dead. The passage occurs indeed in Isaiah, *before* any such use was made of the valley as burning the refuse of the City. It appears therefore to have been a highly metaphorical mode of expressing the highest penalties of the divine justice upon guilty nations and individuals. As the worm itself dies not, but destroys that it feeds upon, and as a fire unquenched consumes that upon which it kindles, so when *temporal judgments* are expressed by this phrase, the utter destruction of persons, cities and nations appears to be intended; but when it refers to a *future state*, and the subject of punishment is, in itself, or by divine appointment, immortal, the idea is heightened to its utmost terror; *their worm* of reflection and remorse ever gnaws; and the fire, which represents the severity of accumulated judgments, is never quenched."

"Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall *not enter therein.*" Mark x. 15. Whether "the kingdom of God" refer to a state of grace here, or to a state of glory hereafter, the declaration of the text is equally true. An entrance into the kingdom of God on earth is necessary to an admission into his kingdom in heaven; an exclusion from the former necessarily implies an exclusion from the latter.

"Then said one unto him, Lord, are there few that be saved? Before noticing the answer of our Lord, observe, — Were Universalism true, our Lord had, on this occasion, as favourable an opportunity, as could ever be presented to him, of stating and confirming its reality, beyond all doubt, by plainly and positively answering this question, and assuring the querist, that *all men* would be

infallibly saved, either in the *present world*, or *out of* the place of *future misery*. We know this would be the answer of an Univeralist Divine to such a question—but the answer of our Lord is at utter irreconcileability with the Univeralist belief. "And he said unto them, *strive* to enter in at the strait gate; for *many* I say unto you, will *seek* to enter in and *shall not be able*." The *strait gate* certainly means the *kingdom of heaven above*, for the phrase, tho' metaphorical, is used synonomously with *being saved;* and, tho' *many* will seek, in a *wrong way*, or *when it is too late*, a view of the subject justified by the context, to *enter into the heavenly state*, yet, it appears, that even *they* will not succeed;—what then must be the condition of those who live in gross violation of the divine law, and give themselves no anxiety whatever concerning their future destiny? The words we have quoted hold out not the slightest encouragement, that future means will be employed for the final salvation into heaven, of those, who gain not, in this world, an entrance into the kingdom of God. The text says, "many will seek to enter in but shall [will] *not be able*"—and there it leaves them. But our Saviour proceeds---"when *once* the master of the house is risen up and *hath* shut *to the door*, and *ye* begin to stand *without*, and to knock at the door saying, Lord, Lord, *open to us*; and he shall answer and say unto *you*, I *know ye not* whence ye are : Then shall ye begin to say, we have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets. But he shall say, I tell you, I know ye not whence ye are; *depart from me* [this, in the Universalist's creed, means, *come unto me*] *ye workers of iniquity*. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see *Abraham*, and *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, and all the *prophets* in the kingdom of God". [Quere : Why is mention *only* made of seeing in heaven those who were known to be *pious* on earth, and not of *others*, who having died in their sins, had been, according

to our opponents' belief, in the *meantime* restored?]—"And *you yourselves* thrust out." Luke xiii. 24—28. Now can any *design* of restoring by the use of future disciplinary means, the souls of the finally condemned to the felicity enjoyed by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, be discovered by this entire passage, so fatal to the unscriptural and ruinous doctrine of Universalism? Which ever way the Sceptic turns—under whatever notions of false criticisms he may entrench himself—whatever excuses he may make or pleas he may urge,—the awful, unbending words of the Judge meet him at every point—"*I know you not, depart from me*, ye workers of iniquity." Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the prophets, are in the kingdom of God, in the heavenly state; but these iniquitous characters are *thrust out*, excluded from the heavenly inheritance. They see the happiness of the righteous, but share not in their felicities—all hope of ever entering "thro' the gates into the City" expires—despair, gloomy, fearful, frantic despair, seizes upon their minds—and whilst they think of mercies abused—of heaven forever lost, and of hell ever to be endured,—*they weep and gnash their teeth*—and here closes their awful history.

"And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass *from* hence *to you* CANNOT, *neither can they* pass *to us* that would come *from thence*." Luke xvi. 26. Is there any *design* of the above nature mentioned here? So far from this, the utter impossibility of ever passing from hell to heaven is expressed in the strongest language:—and, how can there be such a *design*, when the absolute impossibility of the realization of its object, is authoritatively decided? This passage stands, "firm as a rock by surging tides unmoved," against all the attacks of Universalism. In vain do men essay to *bend* its stubborness of truth to an unscriptural creed; and were there not

another intimation in the Bible upon the subject, this passage, in itself, is sufficient to support the doctrine of the eternity of future punishment.

"Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see (enjoy) the kingdom of God." John iii. 3. We have already shown that there is no provision made for this new creation in eternity; therefore, if it take not place in this life, the text decides that the man who dies without it, *cannot*, at any future period, obtain admittance into the "rest which remaineth to the people of God;"—a decision at variance with the idea of a system of future salvable means, and their design of preparing the inhabitants of hell for a subsequent eternity of bliss.

"Know ye not that the *unrighteous*, shall not *inherit* the kingdom of God? Be not *deceived*" (there is then a possibility of being *deceived*,)—"neither fornicators nor adulterers, nor effeminate, &c. nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drundards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, *shall inherit the kingdom of God.*" 1 Cor. vi. 9. 10. [Quere:—Does] this inhibition refer to the *destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman Army?* We ask the question, because many of the Universalists are in the habit of referring all the threatenings of God against sinners to this circumstance—even those threatenings which were denounced against the wicked *after* the destruction of the Jewish City!! But we proceed and remark] The Universalists themselves must acknowledge that the characters the Apostle describes are not *imaginary* but *real;* and it is equally evident that their doom is here sketched by Divine Inspiration, to the utter exclusion of any design of their being restored after ages of ages of suffering to the favour of God and the kingdom of glory. It is presumed that an Universalist, did he design to deliver his views of future punishment, would scarcely employ such language as is here used by the Apostle; and were he to

assure his audience that these characters *shall eventually inherit the kingdom of God*, St. Paul, were he within hearing, would say, "*be not deceived*," for tho' the preacher has assured you that these vile and abominable characters shall finally be admitted to heaven, yet, as an inspired man, I affirm, on the authority of God's word, "*neither* fornicators, &c. *shall* inherit the kingdom of God."

"Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past"—(no *new* doctrine, it seems, with the Apostle) "which *they* which *do such things*, *shall not inherit the kingdom of God*." Gal. v. 19—21. What, again, Paul! exclaims an Universalist. *Shall not inherit the kingdom of God!* that is, you mean to say, that all those who "*do* such things," shall be *eternally lost*, *eternally damned!* You anger me much—my blood boils within me when I read such illiberal, uncharitable language,—language so much opposed to the benevolence of the Diety, and such as is now used by the greater part of the professedly christian world—I imagined you had been better acquainted with your Maker's Will than to fall into such errors—Give me leave, therefore, as one who am your superior in theological knowledge, and who have, with the rest of my brethren, discovered that all who embrace your opinions are but learned *ignoramuses*, to tell you plainly that *you lie*—I *say*, that notwithstanding persons manifest the works of the flesh, they shall eventually inherit the kingdom of their FATHER (true, if you mean the *Devil*, John viii. 44)—for the design of their future discipline is to bring them to heaven. But we imagine that we perceive Paul, moved with holy indignation, and "filled with the Holy

Ghost," setting his eyes on him who withstands him and who seeks to turn away the people from the faith,—and addressing him as he did Elymas the sorcerer—"O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" Acts xiii. 8–10. Well; —we leave the present matter between Paul and the Universalist. If we believe the *latter*, we must reject the testimony of the *former*, and the Scriptures as a fable and a falsehood; but if we credit Paul, we must regard the Universalist doctrine as the most abominable piece of effrontery and blasphemy ever invented by the Devil to accomplish his hellish purposes.

"For this *ye* know"—(*do the Universalists know?*) "that *no* whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath *any inheritance* in the kingdom of Christ and of God." Now we ask, is this "the truth as it is in Jesus? Do not many believe, or pretend to believe, and teach another and an opposite doctrine? Is there not a danger of incautiously opening the ear to their enticing words, and allowing them to steal softly like honey into the heart? There is, and hence to the last quoted words St. Paul immediately adds,—"Let no man" (not even an Universalist, with all his plausibility) "*deceive* you with *vain words* for *because of these things* cometh the *wrath of God* upon the children of disobedience." Eph. v. 5. 6. If then there be a future probationary state, and means are there used with a certain design to bring the children of disobedience to the kingdom of heaven, not the *wrath*, but the *loving kindness*, the tender mercy of God cometh upom them. All, then, that, in this particular, teach differently from the Apostle, viz. that it is the *design* of future discipline to bring whoremongers &c. to a participation of the heavenly inheritance, are *deceived;* they are nothing more or less, according to the Apostle's decision, than positive, unblushing *deceivers*,

and their words are *vain*, having no truth whatever in them.

"But the fearful and unbelieving and the abominable and murderers and whoremongers and sorcerers and idolaters and all liars, shall have *their* part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death. And there shall in *no wise*" (tho' ten thousand Universalists say to the contrary) *enter into it*, (the new Jerusalem) anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." Rev. xxi. 8. 27.

"*Without* are dogs, and sorcerers and whoremongers, and muderers, and idolaters, and whoso loveth and maketh a lie." Ib. xxii. 15.

In many of the previously quoted passages, it is stated plainly, without disguise or reserve, that certain specified wicked characters SHALL NOT, and NEVER SHALL, *enter* into heaven. If, therefore, the Supreme Being declares they *never shall* be admitted into heaven, no person, not under the most inveterate prejudice, and obliquity of moral perception and obduration of heart, can, for a moment, suppose, that, if the characters alluded to, enter into eternity in the state mentioned, they *can* or *will*, at *any future time*, whether longer or shorter it matters not, be *received into heaven*, and that God himself uses means with them for this very purpose. The person asserts, that they *can* and *will* be thus received, impugns the WORD of the ALMIGHTY and most blasphemously impeaches the veracity of Jehovah. Let such an individual tremble lest he be found contending against his Maker! "*Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.*" Prov. xxx. 6.

In the following passage, Our Lord asserts the doctrine we are advocating, as strongly as words can possibly do—"Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way and ye shall seek me, and *shall die in your sins: whither* I go

ye CANNOT *come.*" John viii. 21. Here is not a hypothetical case stated, but a real one, which was subsequently realized by the persons concerned. "Ye shall die in your sins"—this sets the question at rest whether or not persons can die in their sins, and leave the world *unprepared* to meet God,—a fact denied by that portion of the Universalists who believe in no future punishment at all—and it is unequivocally declared, that, they who thus die in their sins, *cannot* go to heaven, into which, Christ, as a triumphant conqueror, has entered. But, if at *any* future period, however distant, they were delivered from the place of future punishment, and admitted to heaven, where Christ is, thro' means used with a fixed design for that purpose,—quere—*would the words of our Lord* be *true?* Would, not the case of such liberated persons prove them to be utterly *false?* And would not the same arguments which are used to substantiate the affirmation that souls may and will be liberated from the prison house of hell, and will be actually brought into the glorious happiness of the children of heaven, prove also that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is a PUBLIC LIAR? Let then the Universalist shudder at throwing the *lie*, yes, the *lie*, for it is nothing less, *upon Christ*, "the faithful and true witness," in whose lips was found no guile. Says Jesus, "whither I go," that is to heaven, "dying in your sins, ye cannot come;" yet, says the Universalists, tho' you die in your sins, ye *shall*, sooner or later, *go to heaven*, and *be for ever with the Lord!* We are again reminded of the third chapter of Genesis, and almost fancy ourselves in the presence of Eve and the Old Serpent. "Father forgive them, they know not what they do!"

Other passages from the Sacred Writings might be adduced to show how utterly repugnant to their meaning, their letter and spirit, is the false notion we have been exposing, that *means* are used in the eternal world with a *certain design* of restoring the damned to the happiness of heaven; but the above will suffice.

Chapter XI.

IF MEANS ARE USED IN THE ETERNAL WORLD FOR SAVING PURPOSES, THERE IS NO REASON TO BELIEVE, THAT, IN EVERY INSTANCE, THEY WILL PROVE EFFECTUAL—IN HELL, THERE IS NO FREEDOM OF THE WILL TO GOOD.

QUESTION FOURTH. *Are the means,* if any, *to be used in the eternal world* for *saving purposes, in every instance effectual? Answer* No.

Here also we append our negative.

The foregoing declarations of Scripture and inferences drawn therefrom, by destroying *the very idea* of a state of *future trial,* and of *means* to be used in the future world for *salvable purposes,* are, in themselves, sufficient to overthrow the affirmative side of this question; and were we so disposed, we might here on this present enquiry, close our remarks, under the full persuasion, that sufficient has been advanced to convince every person of the utter falsity of the system we have opposed. But it may not be a rewardless exercise to follow the Universalist doctrine thro' all its devious and darksome windings, and, by bringing its utmost fallacy to the light, leave its abettors without excuse, and under the influence of that sentence, which declares—"This is the condemnation that light has come into the world and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For

every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light lest his deeds should be reproved." John iii. 19. 20.

Much of the supposed strength of the arguments of the Universalists, as to the certain efficacy of future means of salvation, is founded upon an obvious error, and that is, on the supposition that if means be employed, the damned will readily embrace them, or that the means by the direct interposition of Deity, will be made absolutely efficacious.

Admitting, in this stage of the discussion for the *sake of argument*, that the finally condemned have not lost their moral agency, or their *capability of choosing good*, yet, considering the place of confinement, the nature of their punishment, the company with which they must necessarily associate, and the accumulated strength of sinful habits, their entire case lies directly against the acquirement and perpetuity of virtuous habits; their opportunities of seeking and obtaining good will be immeasurably less than those they enjoyed in this world; and the probability, that, under all the circumstances of their case, they will repent, allowing this to be possible, is so weak as not to sustain, in favour of their moral and spiritual improvement, the *shadow of a hope.*

"If therefore, we grant that the gospel is preached in the intermediate state, the scheme of Universal Restoration is not helped by it, unless it can be proved, that *every devil and every wicked spirit* will *improve* the day of his visitation; but this is impossible. The probability respecting *men*, is on the other side of the question. They are more depraved when they leave this world then they were when they came into it; there is, therefore, no likelihood that the same means which are ineffectual to their recovery here, will be quite sufficient for that purpose hereafter. It is certainly the design of the Gospel to lead men to piety and righteousness in order to their happi-

ness. But is hell a situation favourable to the practice of these virtues? What saints will be found there to stimulate the inhabitants by precept and example to the discharge of these duties? In short, *what room is there for virtue in* HELL? Must sobriety be considered as a virtue, where there is not so much as a single drop of water? Is honesty a virtue where there is no property—no opportunity of cheating, defrauding or stealing? Can the inhabitants of hell feed the hungry, clothe the naked, be fathers to the fatherless, and make the widow's heart dance for joy? And if they be incapable of practising the duties of Christianity, what claim can they have to its privileges?" (3)

"Once more, concerning the nature of this punishment; It is said,—'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption? That is, if sinners persist in their corrupt course, they shall reap a harvest of the same. Their corrupt propensities will be greatly increased and strengthened. Now in hell their corrupt principles are *unrestrained*. What chance then for *consideration* and *repentance*? In this world we find it difficult to convict men burning with lust and raging with passion. We must wait till the flame subsides. But then, what cessation? What check to the unbridled passions? What chance for repentance? The very flame that torments is the flame of sinful passions. This is a worm that never dies; this a fire that shall never be quenched. Stung by this worm, scorched by these flames, harrowed up to an infernal frenzy by these fires, what opportunity for sober reflection? What chance for repentance now? If, in this world, a burning fever, a rheumatic affection, a violent fit of the gout or the stone, entirely disqualifies a man for sober thought, and an understanding exercise of faith; how much less suited will his mind be for those exercises, when he

(3) *D. Isaac's Treatise.*

is cast into 'outer darkness,' where will be 'weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth,' when 'tribulation and anguish, indignation and wrath' are recompensed to the transgressor 'without mixture'? And especially, when this ceaseless tumult and agony of the soul are, in a great measure at least, occasioned by the unbridled rage of those very passions, of which he ought to repent! In this scene of darkness, of sin, and of torment, there can be no repentance, there can be no holiness; and therefore there can be no preparation for heaven. (4)

There is therefore, reason to believe, were the finally rebellious again favoured with a day of grace and with opportunities of amendment, they would still continue obstinate in their abuse of both; and render by their own perverseness, and hatred of good and love of evil, *unavailing* all the means, with which they might be favoured for their restoration.

The statements of Scripture warrant this inference. We have already seen, that there are souls "*in prison*," which at the time of St. Peter, had been under punishment upwards of 2000 years, and no intimation of their recovery. From this fact we conclude, either *no means were employed for their restoration*, or if employed, they *were not embraced*, and consequently *not effectual*. One or the other of these consequences must of necessity follow from the premises; if either Universalism falls.

Again; If men are saved in *this* or in the *other* world, they must be saved as *free agents*. This is the manner in which God deals with them here, and we have no reason to think he will deviate from this method, in the future world, without He has made a plain, unequivocal, undeniable declaration to that effect; but *when* and *where* such a declaration has been made remains to be shown. *Free agency* is in opposition to an *unavoidable necessity* of embracing means. If, therefore, the Universalists con-

(4) *Dr. Fisk's Discourse.*

tend for a future *probationary* state, then the individuals there must be *moral agents*, and being moral agents, their *moral agency* overthrows the affirmative side of the question now under discussion: and there is no certainty, that the *means used*, if any, *will prove effectual in every instance.*

That the Deity has, in this life, used every means, consistent with his own gracious plan and their moral agency, to save individuals, cannot well be denied. "What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done in it?" Is. v. 4. Yet we often see the most highly favoured, notwithstanding all their advantages, living in sin—hating light and loving darkness—resisting the force of truth—grieving and quenching the Spirit—determinedly pursuing iniquity,—until overtaken by death, they unforgiven and unrenewed, are launched into eternity. The means here used for their salvation were ineffectual; and if ever saved, we must either suppose they will *profit by means* which *under infinitely more favourable circumstances* were absolutely inefficacious—an event which we have already shown to be highly improbable—or that *other more efficacious* means will be employed.

But *what* more efficacious means can be employed? Many of the persons, who have made "shipwreck" of their souls, had a liberal education—the Word of God—The death and intercession of the Lord Jesus Christ—The convincing and assisting power of the Holy Spirit—A faithful Ministry—the example, prayers and advices of pious parents and members of Christian Churches—awakenings of conscience—strong desires of salvation—time, opportunity and means to repent, and indeed every assistance needful to their salvation. But thro' the abuse of their moral agency, all these proved without avail; they sinned because the grace of God abounded, and refused to profit by any of their numerous advantages; "because sentence against their evil works was," for gracious pur-

poses," not executed speedily, therefore their hearts were fully set in them to do evil;" and thus not permitting "the goodness and long suffering and forbearance of God to lead them to repentance, after their hardness and impenetent hearts, they treasured up unto themselves wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." Now what more powerful means than these could have been used for their *present* good—what more powerful means than these *can* be used for their *future* good? Let not the Restorationists deceive themselves; we do sincerely believe they will have great cause to congratulate themselves on their good fortune if, in hell, they should be favoured with even one half of the above means, without contending for the possession of superior privileges. Hence, if these means, numerous and, had they not been wilfully counteracted, adequate as they were for saving purposes were inefficient to present salvation, what reason is there to suppose, that, if used, they will be more effectual hereafter? May not the same abuse of moral agency, *defeat*, in another state, as it did in this, the intention of any means which might be employed for the recovery of lost and ruined men?

To say God will employ similar or other means in a *greater* degree and make them *more efficient* in a future state, is to say something which requires proof and which receives no support from the word of God. It is a sufficient answer to this assumption, for an assumption it is, to state, that if these or other means may and will hereafter be used in a greater degree and made absolutely effectual, in every instance, to the salvation of lost sinners, they might and would have been, on the same principle, used thus in *this world*, and all the sin committed in this life would have been avoided, and the suffering endured in the future state would have been escaped. The reasonableness of this statement, on the ground of the above mentioned supposition, must be

granted; for God takes no pleasure in wickedness, or delight in the misery of his creatures—"he doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men." But as these or other means were not used in a greater degree nor rendered absolutely effectual, in every instance, by a benevolent and holy Deity in this world; we very naturally and justly conclude that he will not employ them in this manner to save the obstinately and perseveringly rebellious in the future world; and the assumption that he will, is most gratuitous, unwarranted by any declaration of Divine Truth, and by any known mode of procedure on the part of the Deity.

God will be justified when he speaks and clear when he judges. No man can lay the fault of his "*damnation*" upon his MAKER; for, in the administration of his government of grace, he gives to every person a measure of grace sufficient, if improved, to lead to salvation; but *more* than this, even on the supposition of a state of future discipline none need anticipate. But as persons have rendered of no effect *in Time*, the means of salvation, with which they were favoured, so we maintain it to be the very *acme* of presumption to expect they will be *absolutely*, and in *every instance*, effectual in *Eternity*. To affirm the contrary of this, that God will really *make* them such, is really to *make* Him *unmake* what he has *made*, i. e. destroy man's *moral agency*, (5) which is repugnant to all the *known* methods of God's dealings with men; and the scheme, therefore, which asserts the contrary cannot be received as containing "the truth as it is in Jesus," until it prove its claims to this character by a

(5) We only refer moral agency, to Hell, on the supposition of its being a state of moral discipline; and our argument is intended to meet the Universalists on their own ground. We do not believe hell to be a state of discipline at all, as we have abundantly proved in the former Chapters. Let this one fact that hell is not disciplinary, but punitive, be borne in mind by the reader, and it will prove, in itself, an unanswerable refutation of the unsupported hypothesis of Universal Restoration.

higher authority than that which is derived from mere human opinion, and by stronger arguments than confident and vain declamation. As many, amid all their advantages in this world, were *incorrigible*, there is a high degree of probability, that, on the supposition of the future being a state of probation and of means being there used for gracious purposes, the same incorrigibleness will be evinced by some, in the dark abodes of misery; and be it remembered, that if one only remain incorrigible, this single instance is sufficient to overthrow the whole ruinous system of *Universal Restoration*. It cannot be doubted that many, perhaps thousands, in the days of Christ, committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, which is authoritatively decided to be irremissible in the future world; and hence as many instances of this nature as can be produced, to leave, at present, other cases out of the question, so many instances have we of the utter inefficacy of any means, however numerous or powerful, which may be employed for their salvation.

The following quotations contain the very powerful reasoning of the Rev. Richard Watson on the subject under discussion. "It is also the doctrine of Scripture, that this future punishment of the incorrigible shall be *final* and *unlimited*. This is a monitory doctrine which a revelation only could unfold; but being made, it has no inconsiderable degree of rational evidence. It supposes, it is true, that no future trial shall be allowed to man, the present having been neglected and abused; and to this there is much analogy in the constant procedures of the Divine government in the present life. When many checks and admonitions from the instructions of the wise and the examples of the froward, have been disregarded, poverty and sickness, infamy and death ensue, in a thousand cases which the observation of every man will furnish; the trial of an individual, which is to issue in his present happiness or misery, is terminated: and so far

from its being renewed frequently, in the hope of his finally profiting by a bitter experience, advantages and opportunities once thrown away, can never be recalled. There is nothing therefore contrary to the obvious principles of the Divine government as manifested in this life, in the doctrine which confines the space of man's highest and most solemn probation within certain limits, and beyond them cutting off all his hope. But let this subject be considered by the light thrown upon it by the fact, that the nature of man is *immortal*. With those who deny this to be the prerogative of the thinking principle in man, it would be trifling to hold, this argument; but with those who do not, the consideration of the subject under this view is important.

"The existence of man is never to cease. It follows then from this, that either the future trials to be allowed to those who in the present life have been incorrigible, are to be *limited in number;* or, should they successively fail, are to be *repeated for ever*. If the latter, there can be no ultimate judgment, no punishment or reward; and consequently the Divine government, as implying these, (and this we know it does, from what takes place in the present life,) must be *annihilated*. If this cannot be maintained, is there sufficient reason to conclude, that *all* to whom trial after trial is supposed to be afforded in new and varied circumstances, in order to multiply the probabilities, so to speak, of their final recovery from rebellion, will be at length reclaimed? Before this can be answered, it must be recollected, that a state of suffering which would compel obedience, if we should suppose mere suffering capable of producing this effect, or an exertion of *influence* upon the understanding and will which shall necessitate a definite choice, is neither of them to be assumed as entering into the condition of any new state of trial. Every such future trial, to be probationary at all, that is, in order to bring out the existence of a new

moral principle, and by voluntary acts to *prove* it, must *substantially* be like the present, though its circumstances may vary. Vice must have its allurements; virtue must rise from self-denial, and be led into the *arena* to struggle with difficulty: many present interests and pleasures must be seen in connexion with vice; the rewards of obedience must, as now, be not only more refined than mere sense can be gratified with, but also distant; the mind must be capable of error in its moral estimate of things, through the influence of the senses and passions; and so circumstanced, that those erroneous views shall only be prevented or corrected by watchfulness and a diligent application to meditation, prayer, and the use of those means of information on moral subjects which Almighty God may have put within their reach. We have no right in this argument to imagine to ourselves a future condition where the influence of every circumstance will be directed to render vice most difficult to commit, and virtue most difficult to avoid; for this would not be a state of *trial*; and if, in this present life, men have obstinately resisted all admonitions from heaven; obdurating themselves against all the affecting displays of the Divine kindness, and the deterring manifestations of the Divine majesty; it is most reasonable to conclude, that a part of them at least would abuse successive trials, and frustrate their intention by attachment to present and sensual gratification. What then is to become of them? If we admit a moral government of rational creatures at all, their probation cannot be eternal, for that leads to no result; if probation be appointed, it implies accountability, a judicial decision, and that judicial decision, in the case of the incorrigible, *punishment*. Whenever then the trial, or the series of trials, terminates as to these *immortal* beings, the subsequent punishment, of what kind soever it may be, must be *eternal*. This doctrine of Scripture rests therefore upon others, of which

the rational evidence is abundant and convincing;—that Almighty God exercises a moral government over his creatures; that the present life is a state of moral discipline and trial; and that man is *immortal*. If these are allowed, the eternal duration of future punishment as to the obstinately wicked, must follow; and its accordance with the principles just mentioned, is its rational evidence."(6)

Hitherto we have conducted our argument on the supposition that damned spirits have not lost their moral agency; but what, if MORAL LIBERTY, as implying a *capability of choosing, seeking, embracing,* and *retaining good*, is not possessed by the inhabitants of HELL, WHAT BECOMES OF UNIVERSAL RESTORATION! And yet, if the Scriptures be true, and our argumentation correct, they cannot possess moral liberty as above explained. There is even *now* no *freedom of the will* to that which is *good*, except thro' the received influence of divine grace or the Spirit of God; but there is no exercise of grace, no influence of the Spirit in Hell, (7) and the wills of persons there are only *free to evil*. There is therefore, *in hell, no freedom of the will to good*, and consequently, in the sense above stated, there is there no *moral liberty*; if no moral liberty, there is no *moral obedience*; if no moral obedience, there is the *existence of operative evil*; where there is actual, operative evil, there the *pleasure of God* and a *saving or happy union with Him*, are necessarily absent; "for thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness; neither shall evil dwell with thee;" Ps. v. 4. and where the pleasure of God, his gracious presence, and a saving or happy union with Him, *are not*, there, in the nature of things, *there is no heaven, there is essential misery—there is* HELL. From the very circumstances of their case—the withdrawment of the Holy Spirit and their abandonment to the unchecked

(6) Institutes vol. I. 230—232. (7) See page 107.

sway of their own perverse wills and diabolical passions —their removal from a state of probation and incarceration in the prison-house of Hell,—the damned are *incapable of moral improvement*:—"*It is* IMPOSSIBLE *to renew them to repentance.*" They are strictly speaking "*lost*" "*cast away*" "*destroyed*:"—*like water cast upon the ground*, their moral liberty *can never be gathered up again*:—it is gone—and gone—FOR EVER!

Chapter XII.

Argument from the benevolence of God as being inconsistent with eternal punishment refuted—annihilation not the punishment of the wicked, and is opposed by universalism—recapitulation.

The Benevolence of God is regarded by the Universalists as affording in itself an unanswerable argument against the eternity of future punishment. But they should prove, what they never have yet done, 1. that God's benevolence *can* be exerted in behalf of those under future suffering, who, in this world, contemptuously and continuedly rejected the offers of mercy, *without doing violence* to his other attributes, such as, *holiness*, *justice*, and *truth*.

"A God all-mercy is a God unjust."

We know Him who hath said, "He that being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, shall be suddenly destroyed, and that *without remedy*." Prov. xxix. 1. 2. That it is either expressly or impliedly declared in Scripture, if other means fail, such an act of benevolence *will* be put forth. Without these points are satisfactorily established, all that can be said in favour of them is mere declamation—vain "as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." Even could it be proved that God *can* act thus, without an impeachment of character, a position

which we broadly deny, the question still remains to be settled, *will* he positively and assuredly thus act? Is the certainty of it so clearly ascertained as to exclude every shadow of doubt? Nothing short of the most unqualified assurance of this, can satisfy the mind tremblingly alive to its future and eternal destiny; for the Diety *can* do many things, not in the slightest degree inconsistent with any of his attributes, which we ourselves know He does not think proper to do. How utterly groundless, how extremely, presumptuous, then, is the expectation, that He *will* do what He has not only *not promised*, nor given the least intimation that he is *willing*, to do; but against the performance of which stand in firm and fearful array his justice, truth and holiness; and yet such is the expectation of Universalism as it regards the exercise of Divine benevolence in the future restoration of the damned.

But we object, on our part, to the use of this argument by the Universalists, because 1. It destroys the very idea of the future state being *probationary*; and they must give up either one or the other. 2. It proves that no means are used in the future state for salvable purposes, or that they are ineffectual; otherwise the benevolence of God would not be resorted to. 3. It is only *conjectural*; unwarranted by the conduct of PROVIDENCE, which allows of suffering of various kinds *in this world*, and even of pain or punishment of a limited duration in the *future world itself*, according to the showing of a part of the Universalists themselves. Now the argument from the BENEVOLENCE of the Deity, if of any force at all, is *as much* against *limited*, as it is against *eternal* suffering. For if it would lead the Almighty to terminate the pains of the damned, it would not have allowed pain ever to have entered into this world, nor to be inflicted in the slightest measure on the outcasts from Divine Mercy in the future world. But his benevolence did not prevent

he introduction of misery into this world, nor will it prevent the infliction of it, for *ages of ages*, on the finally mpenitent, as the Restorationists themselves allow. So hat by resorting to the mere benevolence of God, without reference to the personal qualifications of the parties concerned, to uphold their system, they prove too much and so prove nothing. The benevolence of God, therefore, is not inconsistent with punishment, as facts sufficiently demonstrate, and the mere *duration* of that punishment cannot alter the case.

The following extracts place this subject in the clearest light, and must carry conviction to every candid mind.

"The known principles of God's administration, in the moral government of the world, involve suffering; and this suffering, all acknowledge, is in consequence of sin.

"If suffering for sin, in some degree, is not inconsistent with God's goodness, who can determine *when* and *where* that suffering must stop, lest it should *encroach* upon that goodness? God has taught us, by his administration, that sin deserves and receives punishment; and he alone can determine the extent of that punishment. For myself, I know of no argument, drawn from the mercy, love, or goodness of God, against eternal punishment, but such as will, in principle, bear with equal force, against any degree of punishment, and indeed against every kind of suffering.

"If it is said that God must be deficient in *power* or in *goodness*, if he permit the *eternal* misery of any of his creatures, I will prove, by the same reasoning, that God *must be deficient* in *power* or in *goodness*, or he would not have permitted misery *at all*. If it is said that a God of infinite mercy cannot delight in the eternal misery of his creatures; I answer, a God of infinite mercy cannot delight in the sufferings of any of his creatures for *one hour*. If any one should say, 'If I could prevent it, I would not suffer any one to be miserable *forever*;

much more then will not God, who has all power, and whose mercy exceeds mine, as much as the heavens are higher than the earth;'—in reply I might say, If I could prevent it, I would not permit misery *at all*; I would put an end to all the suffering of afflicted humanity every where; much more then God will not permit suffering, who has all power, and whose mercy exceeds mine, as much as the heavens are higher than the earth. But God does not put an end to suffering. Affliction and sorrows are universally experienced; notwithstanding the infinite power and mercy of God. Thus we see, all the the force of the foregoing arguments, against eternal punishment, bears with equal weight against matter of fact. Therefore these arguments are unsound, and should be given up. Every modest man, who is not disposed to set up the results of his own reasoning against the known principles of God's moral government, will, when he finds those results and these principles opposed to each other, give up the former and submit to the latter —"Let God be true, and every man a liar." But you may say, —'Limited suffering is consistent with God's goodness, because he will over-rule all for the good of the sufferers. They will not, in the end, be the losers for their sufferings, but rather the gainers.' To this I answer

(1.) This destroys entirely the *penal sanctions* of God's law. It is saying to man, If you transgress, you shall be punished in such a measure, and to such a degree, as shall, in the end, make you the happier for all your suffering. Who does not see that this is holding out a reward for transgression, rather than a penalty ?

(2) Could not God have made man just as happy, without causing him to suffer at all? If you say he could not, you limit his *power*; if you say he has the power and *not* the *will*, you limit his *goodness*.

'However,' you will say, 'God, for reasons best known to himself, sees it most proper to permit some suffering

in the world, and over-rule it all for the general good.' True; and for ought this reasoning proves to the contrary, God sees it best that the impenitent transgressor, voluntarily living and dying impenitent, should be 'punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.'

"But you cannot see how this can possibly be for the best; and you have many reasons in your mind against it. Neither can I see, how it should be best to have a system involving suffering at all; and I have many reasons in my mind against such a system. Therefore, I never should believe any kind of suffering necessary, if God had not declared it necessary by his word or works. And it is no matter of wonder that I should not have seen the propriety of this; for I have never been the Lord's counsellor. He never has shown me all the secret springs, the wonderful operations, the nice connexions, and the distant bearings, of his moral system. Neither has he shown them to you, nor to any of his creatures. How presuming is it, then, for us to pretend, by our inferential reasoning from the attributes of God, to determine how far the penalty of his law extends? That God's mercy endureth for ever, we must all acknowledge. But what is, or is not, consistent with his mercy, God alone must determine. He has determined it. The inspired Psalmist, in an appeal to God himself, has said, "Unto thee O God, belongeth mercy; for thou renderest to every man according to his works."(8)

If the Divine Benevolence fail them, as they are resolved by some one means or another to abolish the *eternity* of future punishment, perhaps, the Universalists, or some of them at least, will advocate *annihilation*, or a *continued state of unconsciousness*. If so, the *actuality* of Universal salvation is given up. If it be said, that on the soul's being annihilated, or rendered unconscious, it is

(8) *Dr. Fisk's discourse.*

actually *saved from punishment*, we answer, 1. We cannot admit annihilation, or a state of unconsciousness, as fact, as the contrary doctrine is plainly taught in the Scriptures. But 2. Allowing it to be proved, the possibility of which we positively deny, it is evident, the *salvation* from punishment by *annihilation* or *unconsciousness*, is not the salvation contemplated or advocated by Universalism properly so called; for it is strenuously asserted, that, not the *righteous* only, but all the *wicked*, will be *finally* and *eternally saved into heaven*, admitted to a state of *perfect*, and *unlimited enjoyment*:—a salvation, surely, widely different from mere deliverance from suffering by a reduction of the soul to a state of unconsciousness or total annihilation.

The four points, above discussed, constitute the pillars of Universalism, as held by the Restorationists, the advocates of a future limited punishment;—without these it cannot stand; and if they are undermined by the authority of the Sacred Scriptures, the whole system or superstructure erected upon them, is overthrown. Now, without arrogance, we may assert, that from the Sacred Oracles and legitimate inferences therefrom, we have clearly shown, that 1. *The future state is* NOT *probationary*. 2. *That* MEANS *are* NOT *used for the restoration of damned Spirits*. 3. *That the* DESIGN *of the means*, if any, *is* NOT *to prepare the souls of the "lost" for* HEAVEN. And 4. *That there is* NO CERTAINTY *of the means*, were any used, *being effectual for this purpose* IN EVERY INSTANCE; but *that the punishment of the finally impenitent is strictly* ETERNAL.

The conclusion, to which, from these premises, we are necessarily driven, is,—*If Scripture is* TRUE *Universal Restoration is* FALSE—the offspring of "the bottomless Pit"—the "*broad road which leadeth to destruction.*"

Chapter XIII.

Passages explained viz :—Gen. xii. 3—Ps. xxii. 27.—Ps. lxviii. 9.—Is. lvii. 16.—Ezk. xvi. 55.—Matt. xvii. 11.—Acts iii. 21.—Rom. v. 18—Rom. xiv 9.—1 Cor. xv. 22.—1 Cor. xv. 24.—1 Cor. xv. 25. 28.—1 Cor. xv. 26.—Coloss. i. 20.—Philip ii. 10. 11.—1 John iii. 8.—Rev. v. 13.—Rev. xxi. 4.—conclusion.

In the preceding pages we have noticed and explained some of the passages of Holy Writ which are perverted from their true Scriptural meaning to prop up the false and tottering system of Universalism:—a few others will now be submitted to the attention of the reader.

The key to all those passages, which either expressly or impliedly affirm, that, *God has no pleasure in the death of a sinner*, that *he wills all men to be saved*, that *he is the Saviour of all men*,—is given in Chapter III, so that a particular notice of these or similar passages, in this place, is not necessary.

Genesis xii. 3, is quoted to prove Universal salvation:—"In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." This verse is explained by Gal. iii. 8. "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed."—Salvation thro' Christ, the seed of Abraham, constitutes this blessedness, "Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus,

sent him to *bless* you, in *turning away* every one of you *from his iniquities.*" Acts iii. 26. The meaning of the passage is, God, in Christ, has provided salvation for Jew and Gentile, for all mankind; and it is equivalent to the expression, *Christ has tasted death for every man.* The actual reception of this salvation or blessedness depends upon a personal compliance with the conditions on which it is suspended. "So then they which be of *faith* are blessed with faithful Abraham; for *as many* as are of the works of the law are under the curse." Gal. iii. 9,10. This verse, therefore, does not secure the actual salvation of *all* men, unless it can be shown that all men, without exception, "are the *children of God* by *faith* in Christ Jesus."

"All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee." Ps. xxii. 27. "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name." Ps. lxxxvi. 9. These verses contain a prediction of the universal spread of religion during the latter days. The scene evidently refers to *Time* and has not yet been realized. "All the ends of the world," "all nations" &c. have not as yet "remembered," and "turned unto the Lord" &c.:—the prophecy remains to be fulfilled, and will certainly receive its accomplishment in the latter day glory, when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." Is. xi. 9. It is, however, a strange mode of reasoning to attempt to prove from one or both of these verses, that they who remember not God, nor turn unto him, nor worship before him, nor glorify his name, shall be saved! And yet this is the reasoning of Universalism!

"For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." Is. lvii. 16. This is quoted

to show that God will not contend, or be wrath against the finally impenitent forever and that they will be eventually saved. But any other promise given for the encouragement of the truly *penitent* might as well be quoted for this purpose, as the above; for that this is a promise of this nature the context fully proves. "Thus saith the High and Lofty One, that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a *contrite* and *humble spirit*, to revive the *spirit* of the *humble*, and to revive the heart of the *contrite ones*. For I will not contend for ever, &c." That this has no reference to *obstinate, hardened offenders* is so plain as not to deserve further notice.

"When thy (Jerusalem's) sisters, Sodom and her daughters, shall return to their former estate, and Samaria and her daughters shall return to their former estate, then thou (Jerusalem) and thy daughters shall return to their former estate." Ezk. xvi. 55. This passage is looked upon as containing an absolute promise of the deliverance of the Sodomites out of Hell. "It is evident," say the Restorationists, "that the inhabitants of Sodom will be condemned in the day of Judgment, and punished in the lake of fire; consequently the return of their captivity is not to be expected till after the creation of the New Earth."

Their error consists in the supposition that this prophecy will be fulfilled in the *original* inhabitants of Sodom. But the very language in which the doom of the Sodomites is expressed forbids such a construction. The original inhabitants, except Lot and his daughters, were *destroyed, consumed* and *not*, as the context in Ezekiel speaks *sent into captivity*. Now Lot and his daughters were the only inhabitants of Sodom that survived; and we are informed, (Gen. xix. 37, 38) that the Moabites and Ammorites are the descendants of the children of Lot by his daughters; and are therefore to be regarded as the *descendants* of the inhabitants of the destroyed city. Hence

the prophecy of the return of Sodom's and her daughters' captivity will be fulfilled in the persons of the future Ammomites and Moabites. Of this event there is an express prediction and promise. "Yet will I bring again the captivity of Moab, in the latter days, saith the Lord." Jer. xlviii. 47. "I will bring again the captivity of the children of Ammon." Ib. xlix. 6. There is also a promise of the restoration of Jerusalem in its future descendants, "Behold I will take the children of Israel from among the *heathen*, whither they be gone, and gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: and I will make them *one* nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and *one king* shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more *two nations*, neither shall they be *divided* into *two* kingdoms any more at all: &c. moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them forever more, and the *heathen* shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them forever more." Ezkl. xxxvii. 21–28. From the expressions employed it is evident that this predictive promise, the same as contained in the passage under consideration, remains to be accomplished. But will it be accomplished in *Time*, or *after* the Judgment? In *Time* most assuredly; for the Israelites are to be taken from among the "*heathen*" and to "dwell in their own *land*," the "land of their fathers." This then is an established point, Jerusalem, in its descendants, is to be restored in *Time* and not *after* the Judgment. Then the question as to the period of Sodom's restoration is also settled:—on this head the Prophet is very explicit—"*When* I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity, of Sodom and her daughters, and the captivity of Samaria and her daughters, *then* will I bring again, the captivity of thy (Jerusalem's) captives in the

midst of them. *When*, thy sisters, Sodom and her daughters, shall return to their former estate and Samaria and her daughters shall return to their former estate, *then* thou (Jerusalem) and thy daughters shall return to your former estate." Now Jerusalem and her daughters are to be restored in *Time:* but Sodom and her daughters are to be restored *when* Jerusalem and her daughters are restored: therefore Sodom and her daughters are to be restored in *Time*. So then "if it is evident," as the Restorationists affirm, "that the (original) inhabitants of Sodom will be condemned in the day of Judgment and punished in the lake of fire,"—there they must remain under condemnation and punishment for aught the above passage can do to effect their deliverance. We would observe, that, could it be shown that the return spoken of, referred to the original inhabitants of Sodom, we are utterly at a loss to conceive what advantage the Restorationists could derive from the prediction. For *to what* are they to return? To their "*former* estate." But what was their "*former* estate?" *Heaven? Eternal glory and felicity?* No: they were inhabitants of a city in Syria. The very expression "*former* estate," excludes all idea of their being restored to *heaven;* unless it can be proved they were in heaven *before* their *destruction.*

"And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things." Matt. xvii. 11. From this verse it is at once concluded that all lapsed intelligencies, damned spirits and condemned angels, will be restored to heaven. But the word *apokathistemi*, has another signification beside to *replace in a former state*, namely to *complete* or *accomplish*, which is the meaning it should here bear. The Syriac and Persic versions render the passage, "shall complete all things." The "things" to be completed by John were the *events* predicted of him by the prophets; and that John *accomplished* all the predictions uttered concerning him every attentive reader of the Evangalists must be well assured.

"Whom (Jesus Christ) the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Acts iii. 21. A similar meaning to that given above is forced upon this verse. But the noun *apokatastasis*, rendered "restitution," comes from the verb mentioned in the preceding paragraph, and signifies *completion* or *accomplishment;* and the "completion of all things" spoken of in this verse, means the accomplishment of all the promises or predictions, contained in the Old Testament, concerning the kingdom of Christ *on earth* till he shall come to judge the world; for of this have all the prophets spoken; but in no one instance have they spoken of the restoration to heaven of lost and miserable spirits:—to prove the contrary of which we utterly defy the Universalists.

"As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life." Rom. v. 18. This verse is triumphantly quoted as an irrefragable proof of Universal salvation. But the Apostle is not here speaking of *final* salvation; but is striving to uproot the prejudices of the Jews who confined the blessings of salvation to themselves alone, by proving that the atonement of Christ is as extensive as the original offence and consequently that it extends to all, Gentiles as well as Jews; so that now none would be condemned for original sin, as that had been atoned for by the death of Christ:—in this sense, as all had been involved in condemnation by the offence of Adam, so by the sacrifice of Christ justification of life, freedom from the curse of the original transgression, had come upon all. But this still leaves men accountable for their personal transgressions; and tho' the merits of Christ so "abound," as to extend to the pardon of the "many offences" of those who repent and believe, yet, the impeni-

tent and unbelieving are not only liable to future punishment for their many actual sins, but to aggravated punishment for "neglecting the great salvation." "We are unto God a sweet savour of Christ in them that *are saved*, and in them that *perish:* To the one we are the savour of *death* unto *death;* and to the other the savour of *life* unto *life.*" 2 Cor. ii. 15. 16. Some "*perish* for whom Christ *died;*" 1 Cor. viii. 11. and therefore Rom. v. 18, proves not the doctrine which it is brought to establish. See also Heb. x. 29.

"For this end Christ both died and rose and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living." Rom. xiv. 9. What, we ask, has this to do with Universal salvation? The verse is expressive of Christ's authority in both worlds; but authority does not imply salvation. He will exercise his *power* and authority in *punishing* the wicked as well as in rewarding the righteous, 2 Thess. i. 7—10.

"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor. xv. 22. But the utmost this can prove is that all men shall be raised from the dead; but whether their resurrection will be to "life" or to "damnation," is another question, John v. 28. 29.

"Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and authority and power." 1 Cor. xv. 24. The argument from this verse is that, as "Christ's kingdom," which is said to be "for ever," is here declared to "come to an end," so will "future punishment," which is said to be "for ever" come to an end. But this verse says no such thing that Christ's kingdom will come to an end:—it says that, *then* cometh the *end*, the end of the present world, *when* he Christ, shall have *delivered up* the *mediatorial* kingdom to God, &c. *Delivering up* and *coming to an end* are two distinct things. The mediation of Christ, after the termination of

this present system, will cease, but the *kingdom* will be God's forever and forever. The conclusion therefore forced from this verse entirely fails.

"For he must reign, till he hath put all *enemies* under his feet. And when all things shall be *subdued* unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. xv. 25. 28. From this the Universal restoration or salvation of all men is inferred,—but with as much propriety as if it had been inferred from Matthew xxv. 46. The phrases "put all enemies under his feet"—"all things shall be subdued unto him,"—are not expressive of the *grace* or *favor* of Christ, but of his *power* and *authority* in *conquering*, *defeating*, *overthrowing* his foes. His, indeed, must be a *lively* imagination, that can perceive in these expressions any indications of the Saviour's *mercy* towards his *subjugated enemies!*

"The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." 1 Cor. xv. 26. Hence it is concluded that *Hell* will be destroyed. But does the hell of fire rank among the number of Christ's "enemies?" Is it not his "prison" in which he will punish the wicked? Can a "prison" be called an "enemy?" Is it not necessary for the execution of his righteous administration? The hell of fire, therefore, is not included among those "enemies" which shall be "destroyed," the last of which is "death." In Rev. xx. 14. 15. we read, "and *death* and hell, (the term "hell" here being used for the place of separate spirits) were cast into the *lake of fire*. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." The "lake of fire," it appears will exist and persons will be "cast into" it, *after* the destruction of natural death by the *resurrection* of the body:—so that if the "death" of the body is the "*last* enemy that shall be destroyed," the "hell of fire" will not be destroyed but have a subsequent and permanent existence.

"And having made peace through the blood of the cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things, in heaven." Coloss. i. 20. But not one word is said about reconciling things in *hell*, and so the verse has nothing to do with Universal restoration.

"That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Philip ii. 10. 11. Whatever may be understood by the "things under the earth" whether devils or damned spirits in the shades below,—the verses speak of them as *still being* "*under the earth*," and *not* in *heaven*—a fact which must not be lost sight of—and it is not difficult to conceive that even these outcasts from the Divine mercy should be made to "*bow* at the name of Jesus," a strong figurative expression of his acknowledged authority over them, and "*confess* that he is Lord," the Supreme Governor of the universe. As applying to these miserable beings, the words "bow" and "confess," do not imply their voluntary submission to his sway, or their restoration to his favour; but the contrary. In the days of his flesh, devils *confessed* Jesus Christ to be Lord ; but they were not as a natural consequence restored to moral rectitude or spiritual happiness. See Luke iv. 33. 34. The whole passage is a highly figurative expression of the Universally acknowledged authority and power of the Lord Jesus Christ, and has no connexion with the doctrine which the Universalists bring it to support.

"For this purpose the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil." 1 John iii. 8. We briefly despatch this verse by observing, that it might serve the turn of the Universalists, if they could prove, that *punishing sinners in hell* is a *work of the devil !*

"And every creature which is in heaven, and on earth

and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing and honor and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." Rev. v. 13. This verse is quoted as a triumphant proof of future restoration. But it is evident there is no allusion, the most remote, to such an event. The ascription of honour, glory, and power to God and the Lamb by those "under the earth," supposing by these are meant the damned, is nothing more than might be expected; whilst they still abide under the divine wrath and displeasure. See Philip ii. 10. 11. before explained. This verse therefore is not expressive in the least of future restoration. Quere:—If this be the song of the *restored*, why are they said to be still "*under the earth?*" One would suppose if they were *restored*, they would be *in heaven!*

"And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away." Rev. xxi. 4. The "death," here mentioned as being "no more," is not the "second death," as the Universalists vainly endeavour to show, but the death of the "body" which will be raised and rendered immortal. It should also be observed, that the verse is expressive of the happiness of the righteous, of the inhabitants of the "New Jerusalem:"—to apply the declarations which are expressive of the happiness of the righteous to the *wicked* and accursed is just as proper as to apply the perfections of the Diety to the Old Serpent; and yet it is a common practice with the Universalists to appropriate the promises which belong to the "people of God" to those of an opposite character,—the "children of the Devil!"

The above are the principal passages on which the Universalists found their system;—others of the like character might be adduced:—but on the whole they perpe-

trate the greatest perversion, contorting them from their plain and obvious meaning; or not harmonizing them with the general scope of the Scriptures.

The reader is seriously and affectionately requested to weigh the preceding discussions in the balance of a sound, impartial, and discriminating judgment, comparing scripture with scripture; and, under the abiding conviction, that the interests of an eternity are involved in the theoretic and practical results to which he may arrive, to adopt that system of religious belief and practice by which he is willing to die and to be awarded by the judge of quick and dead.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

As the Writer was, during the process of printing, upwards of forty miles from the Press, the reader will not be surprized to find that errors have crept into the work:—the principal of which he is requested to correct as follows

Page 6. 14. line from the top, omit "of."
10. 8. l. do. read, by *reference to* any.
28. 6. l. " read to *be* a propitiation.
" 15. l. from bottom omit de and read claims his liberation.
31. 18. l. " for efferminate read effeminate.
37. 7. l. " for transmission, read transgression.
" 2. l. " for declaration read salvation.
40. 1. l. top, for that read the
42. 20. l. „ omit the.
43. Two last lines, read " Ye shall die in your sins: whither I go ye cannot come."
60. 10. l. top for connection read correction.
64. last line for lark read dark.
68. 6. l. top for influential read inferential.
69. 17. l. bottom for hence read thence.
74. 1. l. top for alterative read alternative.
77. 5. l. " for Did read Does
81. 13. l. " for sin read in
" " " for term read terms
87. 17. l. " for than read that
" 2. l. bottom for absurity read absurdity
93. 13. l. " for filled read fitted
101. in the note after page insert 85
104. 5. l. bottom, omit we.
106. 17. l. top, for Theanthropos, read Theanthropos
107. The line, which ought to have been placed first on this page, is, by mistake, placed first on page 111.
111. The first line here belongs to page 107
113. 11. l. top, for then read than.
118. 9. l. bottom, for now read know.
133. 11. l. bottom for The person asserts, read the person who asserts.
135. 9. l. " for every person read every impartial person.

ERRATA.

As the Writer was, during the process of printing, upwards of forty miles from the Press, the reader will not be surprized to find that errors have crept into the work:—the principal of which he is requested to correct as follows

Page 6. 14. line from the top, omit "of."
10. 8. l. do. read, by *reference to* any.
28. 6. l. " read to *be* a propitiation.
" 15. l. from bottom omit de and read claims his liberation.
31. 18. l. " for efferminate read effeminate.
37. 7. l. " for transmission, read transgression.
" 2. l. " for declaration read salvation.
40. 1. l. top, for that read the
42. 20. l. „ omit the.
43. Two last lines, read " Ye shall die in your sins: whither I go ye cannot come."
60. 10. l. top for connection read correction.
64. last line for lark read dark.
68. 6. l. top for influential read inferential.
69. 17. l. bottom for hence read thence.
74. 1. l. top for alterative read alternative.
77. 5. l. " for Did read Does
81. 13. l. " for sin read in
" " " for term read terms
87. 17. l. " for than read that
" 2. l. bottom for absurity read absurdity
93. 13. l. " for filled read fitted
101. in the note after page insert 85
104. 5. l. bottom, omit we.
106. 17. l. top, for Theanthropos, read Theanthropos
107. The line, which ought to have been placed first on this page, is, by mistake, placed first on page 111.
111. The first line here belongs to page 107
113. 11. l. top, for then read than.
118. 9. l. bottom, for now read know.
133. 11. l. bottom for The person asserts, read the person who asserts.
135. 9. l. " for every person read every impartial person.

C 8218.37.5
Universalism in its modern and anci
Widener Library 000872476
3 2044 081 811 051